

## Byzantium and the Pechenegs

# East Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages, 450–1450

*General Editors*

Florin Curta and Dušan Zupka

VOLUME 79

The titles published in this series are listed at [brill.com/ecee](http://brill.com/ecee)

# Byzantium and the Pechenegs

*The Historiography of the Problem*

*By*

Mykola Melnyk

*Translated by*

Yaroslav Prykhodko



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Cover illustration: Emperor in pursuit of a wolf. Illustration from the *Codex Graecus Matritensis Ioannis Skylitzes*, Fol. 86r. Courtesy Biblioteca Nacional de España.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Melnyk, Mykola, 1976– author. | Prykhodko, Yaroslav, translator.

Title: Byzantium and the Pechenegs : the historiography of the problem / by

Mykola Melnyk ; translated by Yaroslav Prykhodko.

Description: Leiden ; Boston : Brill, [2022] | Series: East Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages, 450-1450, 1872-8103 ; volume 79 | Includes bibliographical references and indexes.

Identifiers: LCCN 2021061750 (print) | LCCN 2021061751 (ebook) | ISBN 9789004280465 (hardback) | ISBN 9789004505223 (ebook)

Subjects: LCSH: Turkic peoples—Byzantine Empire. | Pecheneg (Turkic people)—History—To 1500. | Nomads—Europe, Eastern—History—To 1500. | Pecheneg (Turkic people)—Historiography. | Nomads—Europe, Eastern—Historiography. | Byzantine Empire—History—527-1081. | Byzantine Empire—History—1081-1453. | Byzantine Empire—Ethnic relations. | Byzantine Empire—Historiography.

Classification: LCC DF542.4.T87 M45 2022 (print) | LCC DF542.4.T87 (ebook) | DDC 949.500494/35—dc23/eng/20220128

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2021061750>

LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2021061751>

Typeface for the Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic scripts: “Brill”. See and download: [brill.com/brill-typeface](http://brill.com/brill-typeface).

ISSN 1872-8103

ISBN 978-90-04-28046-5 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-04-50522-3 (e-book)

Copyright 2022 by Koninklijke Brill nv, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill nv incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Hotei, Brill Schöningh, Brill Fink, Brill mentis, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Böhlau Verlag and V&R Unipress.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher. Requests for re-use and/or translations must be addressed to Koninklijke Brill nv via [brill.com](http://brill.com) or [copyright.com](http://copyright.com).

This book is printed on acid-free paper and produced in a sustainable manner.

# Contents

Acknowledgements	VII
Abbreviations	VIII
Introduction	1
<b>1 Byzantium and the Pechenegs</b>	
<i>Vasilievskii to Moravcsik</i>	7
1 Byzantium, the Pechenegs, and the Black Sea Straits	7
2 Byzantium and the Nomads of the North Pontic Steppes in European Historiography, Mid-19th to Mid-20th Centuries	20
2.1 <i>Historical Writing in the Russian Empire before 1917</i>	21
2.2 <i>European Oriental Studies and the History and Languages of the         Medieval Nomads of the Western Eurasian Steppes. Hungarian         and Turkish Historiography</i>	28
2.3 <i>“The Battle for History”: Romanian Historiography, Bulgarian         Historiography, and the Lower Danube in the 10th to 12th         Centuries</i>	41
2.4 <i>Russian and Ukrainian Historiography in the 1920s–1940s</i>	53
2.5 <i>10th- to 11th-Century Relations between Byzantium and         Trans-Danubian Nomads in International Byzantine Studies</i>	62
<b>2 “Poised Perception”</b>	
<i>Trans-Danubian Turks in the Historiography of the     Balkan-Danubian Countries</i>	73
1 Preconditions	73
2 The Pechenegs and Cumans and Their Relations with Byzantium in Hungarian Historiography, Mid-20th to Early 21st Centuries	76
2.1 <i>Hungarian Oriental Studies</i>	76
2.2 <i>Medieval Studies</i>	83
2.3 <i>Archaeology</i>	88
3 Romanian Historiography	96
4 Bulgarian Historiography	136
4.1 <i>Archaeology</i>	138
4.2 <i>Medieval and Byzantine Studies</i>	159
5 Historiography of Other Countries in the Region	176

<b>3 Eastern European Historiography since 1945</b>	190
1 Soviet and Post-Soviet Archaeology	190
1.1 <i>Interpreting the Archaeological Record of the Late Nomads of the North Pontic Steppe</i>	191
1.2 <i>11th- to 12th-Century Nomadic Archaeological Remains in the Prut-Dniester Region</i>	207
1.3 <i>The Pechenegs and the North Crimean Canal: Exploring Nomadic Archaeological Remains in Crimea</i>	222
2 Soviet and Post-Soviet Medieval Studies	236
3 Oriental Studies	252
<b>4 International Byzantine and Oriental Studies</b>	265
1 Congresses of Byzantine Studies	265
2 Publication of Major Sources	276
3 Visions	287
4 Selected Problems in the History of Byzantium's Relations with Steppe Dwellers and Attempts to Solve Them	298
5 Oriental Studies	310
<b>Conclusions</b>	323
1 Periodization	323
2 Source Base and Methodology	325
3 Byzantium, Nomads, and National Historiographies	326
4 Byzantine-Nomadic Relations and International Byzantine and Oriental Studies	327
<b>Selected Bibliography</b>	329
<b>Index of Geographic and Ethnic Names</b>	380
<b>Index of Persons</b>	389
<b>Index of Modern Authors</b>	392

# Acknowledgements

This book is an outcome of my interest in the history of *non-historic peoples* – peoples that no longer exist. The ever-growing demand for grain in Europe, advances in firearms and artillery, and improvement of the heavy plow for the cultivation of steppe soils left the nomadic peoples of the lands north of the Black Sea with no chance to survive. Having dissolved among the plowmen, the steppe peoples were deprived of their history. I hope that my work, among many others, will help to right this injustice.

This study would not have been possible without the luminous academic environment of Lviv, with its towering figure of the late Prof. Yaroslav Dashkevych, whose ideas have influenced me greatly. Despite all the political vicissitudes of the 20th century, he ensured the continuity of the tradition of historical scholarship in the city.

I would like to express my great appreciation to Prof. Florin Curta for his enthusiastic encouragement of my research.

I owe special thanks to my colleagues and friends Dr. Vasyl' Kmet' (Director of the Academic Library at the Ivan Franko National University of Lviv) and Dr. Darius Baronas (Lithuanian Institute of History), who helped me with access to scholarly materials.

My thanks are extended to the staff of the Academic Library at the Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, the Library of the Ukrainian Catholic University, the Vernadsky National Library of Ukraine, and the University of Warsaw Library. Their assistance is greatly appreciated.

I also want to thank Yaroslav Prykhodko for his painstaking work in translating the manuscript into English, which, given my writing style, must have been a challenge.

I am grateful to the entire team at Brill for their kind support and patience.

Finally, I would like to thank my wife Mariya Ivanchak, MA in History, for her professional criticism and linguistic insights.

# Abbreviations

- AB* *Archaeologia Bulgarica* (Sofia).
- Acta Historica Acta Universitatis Szegediensis de Attila József Nominatae. Acta Historica* (Szeged).
- Actes du XIVe Congrès Actes du XIVe Congrès International des Études Byzantines*, 3 vols, eds. Mihai Berza and Eugen Stănescu (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1974–1976).
- ADIU* *Arkheolohiia i Davnya Istorija Ukraïny* (Kyiv).
- AÉ* *Archaeologiai Értesítő* (Budapest).
- AECO* *Archivum Europae Centro-Orientalis* (Budapest).
- AEMAE* *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi* (Wiesbaden).
- Arkheologicheskiye issledovaniya Arkheologicheskiye issledovaniya srednevekovykh pamyatnikov v Dnestrovsko-Prutskom mezhdurech'ye*, ed. Pavel Byrná (Kishinev: Shtiintsa, 1985).
- ASH* *Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*.
- Avars, Bulgars and Magyars Avars, Bulgars and Magyars on the Middle and Lower Danube. Proceedings of the Bulgarian-Hungarian Meeting, Sofia, May 27-28, 2009*, eds. Lyudmila Doncheva-Petkova et al. (Sofia/Piliscsaba, 2014).
- BF* *Byzantinische Forschungen* (Amsterdam).
- BHR* *Bulgarian Historical Review* (Sofia).
- BMGS* *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*.
- BNJ* *Byzantinisch-Neugriechische Jahrbücher* (Berlin).
- BS* *Byzantinoslavica* (Prague).
- Byzanz und Ostmitteleuropa 950-1453 Byzanz und Ostmitteleuropa 950-1453: Beiträge zu einer table-ronde des XIX. International Congress of Byzantine Studies, Copenhagen 1996*, eds. Günter Prinzing and Maciej Salamon (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz Verlag, 1999).
- BZ* *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* (Munich).
- CFHB* *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae*.
- CHBE* *The Cambridge History of Byzantine Empire c.500–1492*, ed. Jonathan Shepard (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2008).
- DAI* *De Administrando Imperio*.
- Die Keramik der Saltovo-Majaki Die Keramik der Saltovo-Majaki Kultur und ihrer Varianten*, ed. Csanád Bálint (Budapest: Institut für Archäologie der Ungarischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1990).
- DOP* *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* (Washington, D.C.).



- ÉB* *Études Balkaniques* (Sofia).
- ÉByz* *Études Byzantines et Post-byzantines* (Bucharest).
- ECEE East Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages, 450–1450 (series).
- Entangled Histories of the Balkans* *Entangled Histories of the Balkans*, vol. 3, *Shared Pasts, Disputed Legacies*, eds. Roumen D. Daskalov and Tchavdar Marinov (Balkan Studies Library, 16) (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2015).
- EthnOboz* *Etnograficheskoye Obozreniye* (Moscow).
- GIBI* *Grütski Izvori za Bülgarskata Istoriya*.
- GSUIF* *Godishnik na Sofüskiya Universitet. Istoricheski Fakultet* (Sofia).
- INMV* *Izvestiya na Narodniya Muzei – Varna* (Varna).
- Istochniki po istorii kochevnikov* VII *Mezhdunarodnaya konferentsiya “Istochniki po istorii kochevnikov srednevekovoy Yevrazii”* (Moscow: Probel-2000, 2013).
- IstPreg* *Istoricheski Pregled* (Sofia).
- Izbrani proizvedeniya* Zlatarski, Vasil, *Izbrani proizvedeniya*, 4 vols, ed. Petür Petrov (Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 1984).
- JÖB* *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinischen Gesellschaft* (Vienna).
- KCsA* *Körösi Csoma Archivum* (Budapest).
- Kiyevskaya Rus’ i kochevniki* Mavrodina, Ruslana M. *Kiyevskaya Rus’ i kochevniki (pechenegi, torki, polovtsy). Istoriograficheskiy ocherk* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1983).
- MAIET* *Materialy po Arkheologii, Istorii i Etnografii Tavrii* (Simferopol).
- Manufacturing a Past for the Present* *Manufacturing a Past for the Present: Forgery and Authenticity in Medievalist Texts and Objects in Nineteenth-Century Europe*, eds. János M. Bak, Patrick J. Geary and Gábor Klaniczay (National Cultivation of Culture, 7) (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2014).
- MCA* *Materiale și Cercetări Arheologice* (Bucharest).
- ODB* *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, 3 vols, ed. Alexandr P. Kazhdan (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991).
- Odürtsi, 1* Lyudmila Doncheva-Petkova, Lazar K. Ninov and Veselin Ī. Parushev, *Odürtsi*, vol. 1, *Selishte ot Pürvoto bülgarsko tsarstvo* (Sofia: Akademichno izdatelstvo “Prof. Marin Drinov,” 1999).
- Odürtsi, 2* Lyudmila Doncheva-Petkova, *Odürtsi*, vol. 2, *Nekropoli ot XI vek* (Sofia: Akademichno izdatelstvo “Prof. Marin Drinov,” 2005).
- Orientalische Berichte über die Völker Osteuropas* Hansgerd Göckenjan and István Zimonyi, *Orientalische Berichte über die Völker Osteuropas und Zentralasiens im Mittelalter: die Ćayhani-Tradition (Ibn Rusta, Gardizī, Ĥudūdāl-Ālam, al-Bakrī und al-Marwazī)* (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica, 54) (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag in Kommission, 2001).

- Prinos lui Petre Diaconu Prinos lui Petre Diaconu la 80 de ani*, eds. Ionel Căndea, Valeriu Sîrbu and Marian Neagu (Brăila: Istros, 2004).
- RAIK** Russian Archaeological Institute in Constantinople.
- RdI** *Revista de Istorie* (Bucharest).
- RÉB** *Revue des Études Byzantines* (Paris).
- Relations between the autochthonous population Relations between the Autochthonous Population and the Migratory Populations on the Territory of Romania*, eds. Miron Constantinescu et al. (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1975).
- Research on the Prehistory of the Hungarians Research on the Prehistory of the Hungarians: A Review. Papers presented at the Meetings of the Institute of Archaeology of the HAS, 2003-2004*, ed. Balázs Gusztáv Mende (Budapest: Archaeological Institute of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, 2005).
- RÉSEE** *Revue des Études Sud-Est Européennes* (Bucharest).
- RI** *Revista Istorică* (Bucharest).
- RIR** *Revista Istorică Română* (Bucharest).
- RO** *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* (Warsaw).
- RosArkh** *Rossiyskaya Arkheologiya* (Moscow).
- Rossiya mezhdru Yevropoy i Aziyey Rossiya mezhdru Yevropoy i Aziyey: yevraziyskiy soblazn*, eds. Lyudmila Novikova and Irina Sizemskaya (Moscow: Nauka, 1993).
- RRH** *Revue Roumaine d'Histoire* (Bucharest).
- Rusko-bŭlgarski vrŭzki Rusko-bŭlgarski vrŭzki prez vekovite*, ed. Gennadii G. Litavrin (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bŭlgarskata akademiya na naukite, 1986).
- SBS** *Studies in Byzantine Sigillography* (Washington, D. C.).
- SCIM** *Studii ŝi Cercetări de Istorie Medie* (Bucharest).
- SCIV/SCIVA** *Studii ŝi Cercetări de Istorie Veche/ŝi Arheologie* (Bucharest).
- SEER** *The Slavonic and East European Review* (London).
- Simeonova Bŭlgariya Simeonova Bŭlgariya v istoriyata na Evropeŝkiya Yugoiztok: 100 godini ot bitkata pri Akheloŭ*, eds. Angel Nikolov and Nikolaï Kanev (Sofia: Universitetsko izdatelstvo "Sv. Kliment Okhridski," 2018).
- SK** *Seminarium Kondakovianum* (Prague/Belgrade).
- SOF** *Sŭdost-Forschungen* (Regensburg).
- SovArkh** *Sovetskaya Arkheologiya* (Moscow).
- SovEthn** *Sovetskaya Ethnographiya* (Moscow).
- SRdI** *Studii. Revistă de Istorie* (Bucharest).
- SSv** *Skhidnyĭ Svit* (Kyiv).
- Stepi Yevrazii v epokhu srednevekov'ya Stepĭ Yevrazii v epokhu srednevekov'ya*, ed. Svetlana A. Pletnyova (Moscow: Nauka, 1981).

- The Other Europe* *The Other Europe in the Middle Ages. Avars, Bulgars, Khazars, and Cumans*, eds. Florin Curta and Roman Kovalev (East Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages, 2) (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2008).
- The Proceedings of the XIIIth International Congress* *The Proceedings of the XIIIth International Congress of Byzantine Studies*. (Oxford, 5–10 Sept. 1966), eds. Joan M. Hussey, Dimitri Obolensky and Steven Runsiman (London/New York: Oxford University Press, 1967).
- The Steppe Lands and the World beyond Them* *The Steppe Lands and the World beyond Them: Studies in Honor of Victor Spinei on his 70th Birthday*, eds. Florin Curta and Bogdan-Petru Maleon (Iași: Editura Universității “Alexandru Ioan Cuza,” 2013).
- The Turks* *The Turks*, vol. 1, *Early Ages*, eds. Hasan Güzel et al. (Ankara: Yeni Türkiye, 2002).
- The World of the Khazars* *The World of the Khazars: New Perspectives. Selected Papers from the Jerusalem 1999 International Khazar Colloquium hosted by the Ben Zvi Institute*, eds. Peter B. Golden, Haggai Ben-Shammai and András Roná-Tas (Handbook of Oriental Studies. Section 8 Uralic & Central Asian Studies, 17) (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2007).
- TVDAE *Trudy Volgo-Donskoy arkheologicheskoy ekspeditsii*, 3 vols (Moscow/Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1958, 1959, 1963).
- Tyurkskiye kochevniki v Azii i Yevrope* *Tyurkskiye kochevniki v Azii i Yevrope: tsivilizatsionnyye aspekty istorii i kul'tury*, eds. Dmitrii D. Vasil'yev, Yulii I. Drobyshev and István Zimonyi (Trudy Instituta vostokovedeniya RAN, 7) (Moscow: Institut vostokovedeniya Rossiyskoy akademii nauk, 2018).
- UAJ *Ural-Altaysche Jahrbücher* (Wiesbaden).
- VDAE Volga-Don Archaeological Expedition (1949–1951).
- VDI *Vestnik Drevney Istorii* (Moscow).
- VizVrem *Vizantiyskiy Vremennik* (Saint Petersburg/Moscow).
- VopIs *Voprosy Istorii* (Moscow).
- Vtori mezhdunaroden kongres* *Vtori mezhdunaroden kongres po búlgaristika. Dokladi*, Vol. 6. *Búlgarskite zemi v drevnostta. Búlgariya prez srednovekovieto*, ed. Khristo Khristov (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Búlgarskata akademiya na naukite, 1987).
- ZOOID *Zapiski Odesskago Obshchestva Istorii i Drevnostey* (Odessa).
- ZhMNP *Zhurnal Ministerstva Narodnogo Prosveshcheniya* (Saint Petersburg).
- ZRVI *Zbornik Radova Vizantološkog Instituta* (Belgrade).
- Zúduló sasok* *Zúduló sasok: Új honfoglalók – besenyők, kunok, jászok – a középkori Alföldön és a Mezőföldön*, eds. Gábor Hatházi et al. (Gyula, 1996).



# Introduction

By the time Vasilii Vasilievskii published his study “Byzantium and the Pechenegs (1048–1094)” in 1872,<sup>1</sup> a scattering of place names was all that was left of the Pechenegs and Torks-Uzes of Central, Eastern, and Southeastern Europe. István Varró, a member of the Jász-Cuman mission to the empress of Austria Maria Theresa<sup>2</sup> and the known last speaker of the Cuman language (at least he knew the *Pater Noster* in Cuman), died in 1770.

The British traveler Aubrey Herbert,<sup>3</sup> on his way from Sarajevo to Constantinople via the *sanjak* of Novi Pazar, witnessed a collapse of central authority and a ubiquitous presence of ethnic-based bands of outlaws. In a diary entry from 25 August 1912, he called them “descendants of the Patzinaks who bothered the Crusaders so much.”<sup>4</sup> Of course, this was less an ethnographic observation than an echo of Herbert’s first-rate education in history, showing his familiarity with reports by the chroniclers of the First Crusade, Peter Tudebode or Albert of Aachen, on the crusaders’ progress through the Balkans. Nonetheless, Herbert’s words are a testimony to the deep mark left by the Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans in the history of the Balkan-Danubian region and Europe as a whole.

After making their first appearance north of the Black Sea in the 9th century, the Pechenegs quickly became a decisive factor in the history of Eastern and Southeastern Europe. They greatly contributed to the demise of the Khazar Khaganate and caused the relocation of the Magyars to Pannonia and thus, indirectly, the formation of the Hungarian state; their activities were also one of the principal, albeit often neglected, triggers in the rise of the Rus’ state.

With the demise of early medieval Bulgaria and restoration of Constantinople’s rule in the northern Balkans shortly before the year 1000, the Pechenegs became Byzantium’s neighbors. Beginning in the second quarter of

---

1 Vasilii G. Vasilievskii, “Vizantiya i pecheněgi (1048–1094),” *ZhMNP* 164 (1872), no. 11, 116–65; *ZhMNP* 164 (1872), no. 12, 243–332.

2 See: Nora Berend, “Forging the Cuman Law, Forging an Identity,” in *Manufacturing a Past for the Present*, 109–28.

3 On the British officer, diplomat, spy, and Member of Parliament Aubrey Herbert and his role in Albania’s gaining of its independence, see: Jason Tomes, “Aubrey Herbert and Albania,” in *Albania’s Greatest Friend. Aubrey Herbert and the Making of Modern Albania: Diaries and Papers 1904–1923*, eds. Bejtullah Destani and Jason Tomes with a Preface by Noel Malcolm (London/New York: I.B. Tauris, 2011), XIII–XXIV.

4 Aubrey Herbert, *Ben Kendim: A Record of Eastern Travel* (London: Hutchinson and Co, 1924), 199; *Albania’s Greatest Friend*, 53.

the 11th century, the empire was the main target of their raids. Incursions of the Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans, their participation in anti-Byzantine coalitions on the side of either the Hungarians or the Seljuks, their involvement in local rebellions in the northern Balkans, and conflicts in their own midst all had a considerable impact on Byzantium.

Meanwhile, emperors recruited nomads as border guards, as well as soldiers for wars in Anatolia and the Balkans. There are good reasons to believe that during the second half of the 11th century a Pecheneg political entity emerged, known in the sources as Πατζιναχία. Despite the disappearance of that polity shortly before 1100, and the subsequent stabilization of Byzantine power on the Lower Danube under Alexios I Komnenos, waves of nomadic attacks continued well into the 12th century. The migration of the Cumans into the Danubian region, which began in the last third of the 11th century, was one of the critical factors contributing to Byzantium's loss of a large part of its European possessions towards the end of the following century as a consequence of the rebellion of the Assenids and the rise of the so-called Second Bulgarian Empire.

Equally significant is the cultural dimension of the confrontation between the nomads and Constantinople in the 10th and 11th centuries. Greek sources report several attempts to baptize the Pechenegs; there are references to their becoming familiar with Islam while in the Balkans. Archaeological materials point to a process of gradual social change and sedentarization among the nomads in the region.

Even though a lot of work has been done on the subject of relations between Byzantium and the nomads of the North Pontic steppes in the 10th and 11th centuries, there is no general historiographical overview of the entire body of research on this problem. Existing historiographical treatments focus on narrow, chronologically and/or thematically specific questions. In Volume One of his *Byzantinoturcica* (1942), Gyula Moravcsik offered a first bibliographic survey of the accomplishments of Byzantine and Oriental studies around the world.<sup>5</sup> However, the Hungarian scholar did not go into much detail on historiography. Neither have the authors of subsequent important monographic

---

5 Gyula Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica I. Die Byzantinischen Quellen der Geschichte der Türkvölker; Byzantinoturcica II. Sprachreste der Türkvölker in den byzantinischen Quellen* (Magyar-görög tanulmányok, 20–21) (Budapest: Királyi Magyar Pázmány Péter Tudományegyetemi, Görög Filológiai Intézet, 1942–1943). 2nd ed. (Berliner byzantinistische Arbeiten, 11) (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1958). Hereafter, quotations from the *Byzantinoturcica* will be given after the second, Berlin edition, if not stated otherwise.

studies in this field, such as Petre Diaconu,<sup>6</sup> Vasilka Tăpkova-Zaimova,<sup>7</sup> Paul Stephenson,<sup>8</sup> Igor' Knyazkiĭ,<sup>9</sup> Victor Spinei,<sup>10</sup> Alexandru Madgearu,<sup>11</sup> and Marek Meško.<sup>12</sup> All these scholars apply the historiographical perspective only to individual issues. Some authors limit themselves to bibliographies, often quite selective.<sup>13</sup> A similar approach may be observed in commentaries to sources published in translation.<sup>14</sup>

In the introduction to his book on Byzantium's Balkan frontier, Paul Stephenson briefly describes the problem of the frontier in historiography,<sup>15</sup> outlines the changing trends in the study of Byzantine history of the 10th and 11th centuries in the Western scholarship of the second half of the 20th century,<sup>16</sup> and shows the importance of archaeology and numismatics for Byzantine studies.<sup>17</sup> He does not, however, consider the major works that deal

- 
- 6 Petre Diaconu, *Les Petchénègues au Bas-Danube* (Bibliotheca historica Romaniae, 27) (Bucharest: Éditions de l'Académie de la République socialiste de Roumanie, 1970); Idem, *Les Coumans au Bas-Danube aux XI et XII siècles* (Bibliotheca historica Romaniae, Études, 56) (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1978).
- 7 Vasilka Tăpkova-Zaimova, *Dolni Dunav – granichna zona na Vizantijskiya zapad: Kŭm istoriyata na severnite i severoiztochnite bŭlgarski zemi, kraya na X–XII v.* (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bŭlgarskata akademiya na naukite, 1976).
- 8 Paul Stephenson, *Byzantium's Balkan Frontier. A Political Study of the Northern Balkans, 900–1204* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
- 9 Igor' O. Knyazkiĭ, *Vizantiya i kochevniki yuzhnorusskikh stepey* (Kolomna: Izdatel'stvo Kolomenskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo instituta, 2000).
- 10 Victor Spinei, *The Romanians and the Turkic Nomads North of the Danube Delta from the Tenth to the Mid-Thirteenth Century* (ECEE, 6) (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2009); Idem, *The Great Migrations in the East and South East of Europe from the Ninth to the Thirteenth Century* (Cluj-Napoca: Istros Publishing House, 2003).
- 11 Alexandru Madgearu, *Byzantine Military Organization on the Danube, 10th–12th Centuries* (ECEE, 22) (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2013).
- 12 Marek Meško, *Obnova byzantskej moci na Balkáne za vlády Alexia I. Komnénata. Druhá byzantsko-pečenežská vojna (1083–1091)* (Nitra: Vydavateľ Univerzity Konštantína Filozofa v Nitre, 2012), 11–16.
- 13 András Pálóczi-Horváth, *Pechenegs, Cumans, Iasians: Steppe Peoples in Medieval Hungary*, trans. Timothy Wilkinson (Budapest: Corvina, 1989), 125–7; Edward Tryjarski, "Pieczyngowie," in Krzysztof Dąbrowski, Teresa Nagrodzka-Majchrzyk and Edward Tryjarski, *Hunowie Europejscy, Protobułgarzy, Chazarowie, Pieczyngowie* (Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1975), 484–94.
- 14 See, for instance, Konstantin Bagryanorodnyĭ, *Ob upravlenii imperiyey. Tekst, perevod, kommentarii*, eds. Gennadiĭ G. Litavrin and Anatoliĭ P. Novosel'tsev (Moscow: Nauka, 1989).
- 15 Stephenson, *Byzantium's Balkan Frontier*, 4–7.
- 16 *Ibid.*, 7–13.
- 17 *Ibid.*, 13–17.

with the specific issue addressed in his monograph, namely relations between Byzantium and the nomads from across the Danube. Alexandru Madgearu's book includes a small overview of the historiography since 1946, the year when Nicolae Bănescu published his *Duchés byzantins du Paristrion (Paradounavon) et de Bulgarie*. Madgearu also briefly lists the key works and archaeological studies of the second half of the 20th and early 21st centuries.<sup>18</sup> Florin Curta emphasizes the importance of archaeological data for any discussion regarding the history of medieval Southeastern Europe.<sup>19</sup>

Purely historiographical works pertaining to the subject of this book do exist. For example, Ruslana Mavrodina's *Kyivan Rus' and Nomads*<sup>20</sup> traces a paradigm shift in the study of nomads in Russian and Soviet historiography from the 18th century to the 1970s. However, Mavrodina does not consider the international context and makes no mention of foreign influences on Russian and Soviet scholars. Peter Golden has published an overview of studies, including archaeological, in the history of the Khazar Khaganate and the steppe peoples.<sup>21</sup> The Bulgarian Orientalist Valeri Stoyanov, analyses the achievements of global historiography in the study of the Cumans.<sup>22</sup> Mikhail V. Bibikov offers a survey of the historiography of Byzantine sources relating to the history of the North Pontic steppes and the Caucasus.<sup>23</sup> His book was the first to cover an extended timespan – from the appearance of Byzantine texts in Rus' to their revision in the 1970s. However, the most recent work quoted by Bibikov came out in 1980, even though Byzantine studies and related disciplines made significant progress in the following decades. Inasmuch as Bibikov's monograph focuses on written sources, it omits the achievements of archaeologists and Orientalists in the study of Byzantine-nomadic relations.

The present work is therefore the first attempt to treat the problem as a whole from the historiographical point of view, ranging over almost 150 years since Vasilii Vasilievskii's "Byzantium and the Pechenegs" and across a wide gamut of studies of written, archaeological, numismatic, and sigillographic sources, as well as linguistic scholarship. The book tackles the research

18 Madgearu, *Byzantine Military Organization*, 1–5.

19 Florin Curta, *Southeastern Europe in the Middle Ages, 500–1250* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 21–8.

20 *Kiyevskaya Rus' i kochevniki*.

21 Peter B. Golden, "Khazar Studies: Achievements and Perspectives," in *The World of the Khazars*, 31–5.

22 Valeri Stoyanov, *Kumanologiya: Istoriografski eskizi*, 2 vols (Sofia: Institut po istoriya pri BAN, 2009); Osman Karatay, "[Review of:] Valeri Stoyanov, *Kumanologiya: Opiti za Rekonstruktsiya*," in *Karadeniz Arařtırmaları* 20 (2009), 157–60.

23 Mikhail V. Bibikov, *Vizantiyskiye istochniki po istorii Drevney Rusi i Kavkaza* (Saint Petersburg: Aleteya, 1999), 17–60.



output of the principal centers of Byzantine studies and the national historiographies of the countries of Central, Eastern and Southeastern Europe. Geographically, it covers a territory from the Taman Peninsula to Belgrade; chronologically – the period from the late 9th century to the year 1122 (from the appearance of the Pechenegs in the northern Black Sea steppes to the Battle of Beroia). Therefore, it will focus primarily on the historiography of the history of the Pechenegs and Uzes in the Balkans. The zenith of the Cumans in this region came somewhat later, in the 12th and 13th centuries, and the “Cuman” historiography, thanks to the efforts of Valeri Stoyanov, is much better studied.

This book’s objectives are: to trace the formation and evolution of the field in question in the context of global historiography; to analyse changes triggered by newly-discovered sources and transformations in methodological frameworks; to identify possible connections between national historiographical paradigms and the study of relations between the Byzantine Empire and neighboring nomads; to show how the study of the subject has responded to seminal advances in Byzantine studies; and to outline the state of knowledge on the subject and prospects for further research.

The book is designed to work on two levels. The first level is purely “factual,” in that it deals with what we know about Byzantine-nomadic relations in terms of names, dates, locations, idiom, the nature and course of events, and their probable causes, consequences, and place in regional and global history. Because very little is actually known with certainty about many episodes in relations between Byzantium and the Pechenegs, there has been a great deal of academic discussion around such “facts” as dates and locations of events and their participants, and even around the possibility that some events the descriptions or reports of which have come down to us may have been the fruit of authorial imagination. The “factual” level of the book is therefore intended to show how source criticism, the discovery of burial sites, pottery, coins and seals, and even astronomical observation have advanced our understanding of the history of the region.

The other level of analysis is “ideological,” conceptual. On this level, I attempt to show how interpretation of events has evolved within the framework of the historiography of Byzantine-nomadic relations and to what extent it has been affected by state ideologies, including nationalism, Marxism, or Eurasianism, and by latent or open territorial disputes between countries. Although at first glance the subject of this work is far removed from politics, its study has reflected every dominant trend in the national historiographies of Romania, Bulgaria, Hungary, the Soviet Union, and a number of other countries. The book demonstrates not only the close ideological connection between the events of the 19th and 20th centuries and the study of nomads,

but also the fact that politicians have often given direct orders to historians to re-write history. It is questionable whether it has been any historian's intention to look specifically for nomads.

The earliest beginnings of the study of relations between Byzantium and the nomads of the North Pontic steppes coincided with the rise of Byzantine studies as an academic discipline. To describe the phases in the development of this historiographic tradition, I employ the concepts of *paradigm* and *paradigm shift*, borrowed from the work of the American historian and philosopher of science Thomas S. Kuhn (1922–96), especially from his *Structure of Scientific Revolutions*.

I also draw on the theory of discourse and discursive practices. Both components of the subject the historiography of which I consider (Byzantium and the nomads) constitute entities (the *imperium* and medieval nations) that have long disappeared from the political and ethnic reality and cannot represent themselves in the manner in which, for example, a French historian can write about the history of France, or an ethnologist from Bilbao – about the past of the Basques.<sup>24</sup> The history of Byzantium's relations with the Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans has been studied predominantly by “Western” scholars. It is thus an instance of Orientalism, both as a study of the “East” by the “West” and as an episode in the specifically “Orientalist” discourse in the sense given to the term by Edward Said.

This book will appeal to all who are interested in medieval studies in general and the history of Southeastern Europe, the history of Byzantium and neighbouring medieval states, and the history of the Turkic peoples, as well as historiography and the history of scholarship in the 19th to 21st centuries.

24 Constantin Zuckerman joked, sadly, that “[D]’autres spécialistes, dont plusieurs chercheurs hongrois, croient que le fort de Sarkel a été érigé contre les Hongrois. Enfin, on évoque aussi les Petchénègues, mais l’absence de savants petchénegues affaiblit sensiblement cette cause qui, il faut bien l’avouer, repose sur peu de chose”: Constantin Zuckerman, “Les Hongrois au pays de Lebedia: Une nouvelle puissance aux confins de Byzance et de la Khazarie ca 836–889,” in *To empólemo Vyzántio (908–1208 ai.)*, ed. Kóstas Tsiknakis (Athens: Goulandri-Horn Foundation, 1997), 51–2.

# Byzantium and the Pechenegs

*Vasilievskii to Moravcsik*

Лежала я вечер в беседке ханской  
В середине бусурман и веры мусульманской,  
...  
Вокруг беседки той орда их кочевала  
И из любви ко мне тут близко ночевала.  
О Божьи чудеса! из предков кто моих  
Спокойно почивал от орд и ханов их?  
А мне мешает спать среди Бахчисарая  
Табашный дым и крик; но, впрочем, место рая;  
Иль не помнит кто нашествий их на Русь,  
Как разорjali все, как наводили трус?  
Хвалю тебя, мой друг, занявши здешний край,  
Ты бдением своим все вяще укрепляй.

From EMPRESS CATHERINE II's letter in verse to Count Potëmkin, 1787<sup>1</sup>



## 1 Byzantium, the Pechenegs, and the Black Sea Straits

“Byzantium and the Pechenegs,” a survey of a vanished people’s dealings with the empire, came out before any book on relations between Byzantium and any of the ethnic groups that were experiencing a national revival in the 19th century, such as the Serbs, Bulgarians, or Romanians.<sup>2</sup> Perhaps this was because

- 
- 1 In this passage, the empress describes a horde of Tatars roaming nearby, out of respect for her, while she is resting in Bakhchysarai. She asks the addressee rhetorically if he could ever have imagined such a thing, considering the long history of nomadic attacks on Rus’. Manuscript Section at the Russian National Library. Collection 650 (The Romanovs). Inventory 1. Storage item 424. For an English translation of the poem, see Andreas Schönle, *The Ruler in the Garden: Politics and Landscape Design in Imperial Russia* (Russian Transformations: Literature, Culture and Ideas) (Oxford: Peter Lang AG, 2007), 89.
  - 2 Stanoje Stanojević, *Vizantija i Srbi*, 2 vols (Novi Sad: Matica srpska, 1903–1906); Marin Drinov, “Yuzhnyye slavyani i Vizantiya v X veke,” *Chteniya v Imperatorskom obshchestve istorii i drevnostey rossyiskikh pri Moskovskom universitete* 3 (1875), no. 3, 1–152; Orest Tafrali, *Bizanțul și influența lui asupra țării noastre* (Bucharest, 1914).

“Byzantium, the Pechenegs, and Rus” would have been a more accurate title for Vasilievskii’s study.

Vasilii Vasilievskii (1838–99) authored one of the best works in 19th-century Byzantine studies. It had a solid source base<sup>3</sup> and engaged deeply with the latest scholarship. The range of sources for this field of study would not expand significantly for another seven decades, until the appearance in the second half of the 20th century of Gyula Moravcsik’s *Byzantinoturcica*<sup>4</sup> and several other works, particularly in archaeology.<sup>5</sup> Vasilievskii himself, with his intellectual roots in Mikhail Kutorga’s school of classical philology,<sup>6</sup> was actively engaged in the publication of sources and consulted the best classical philologists

3 This monographic study was reprinted posthumously in the first volume of the four-volume collected works, published by the Imperial Academy of Sciences: *Trudy V. G. Vasil'yevskago*, vol. 1 (Saint Petersburg: Izdaniye Imperatorskoy Akademii nauk, 1908), 1–175. Hereafter, quotations from “Vizantiya i pechenēgi (1048–1094)” will be given after the posthumous edition – *Trudy V. G. Vasil'yevskago*. “Byzantium and the Pechenegs” included five appendices: “On the *Codex Cumanicus*” (information about this source was designed to confirm the extremely close ethnic connection between the Pechenegs, Torks, and Cumans on the one hand and the Seljuk and Ottoman Turks on the other), “The Rus’ on the Danube in the 11th Century,” “Theophylact of Ohrid and His Works” (identifying the *terminus post* and *ante quem* of one of the speeches allowed the scholar to date some of Theophylact’s statements about the Pechenegs: Vasilievskii, “Vizantiya i pechenēgi (1048–1094),” 146), “On the Epistles from Emperor Alexios Komnenos to Robert, Count of Flanders,” and “On the Divination of God’s Will with Two Lots,” as well as a small note, “Ioannes Prodromos, the Metropolitan of Kyiv.” Among the Greek authors whose works Vasilievskii used were Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, Michael Psellos, Theophylact of Ohrid, Eustathius of Thessalonica, Niketas Choniates, Anna Komnene, Georgios Kedrenos, Ioannes Skylitzes, Ioannes Zonaras, Michael Attaleiates, Georgios Akropolites, and Nikephoros Bryennios. The Oriental authors included Michael the Syrian, Ali Ibn al-Athir, Yahya of Antioch, and others; Western works – Rabbi Petachiah of Regensburg, Otto of Freising, the chronicles of Siegbert of Gembloux and Bernold of Constance, *Annales Barenenses*, Bruno of Querfurt’s *Epistola ad Henricum Regem*, *Codex Cumanicus*, and others. Vasilievskii did not overlook Rus’ sources either – specifically the *Primary Chronicle* and *The Tale of Igor’s Campaign*. For the Greek and Latin sources, Vasilievskii followed the editions in *Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Series Graeca* (vols. 1–161, ed. Jacques Paul Migne, Paris, 1857–1866) and *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz, Hanover, 1826–1874).

4 Gyula Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica I–II* (Budapest, 1942–1943).

5 “Byzantium and the Pechenegs” does not cite any archaeological sources, even though Vasilievskii had an interest in archaeology and took part in the II, III, and VI Archaeological Congresses. At the last of these, he even chaired the section on Byzantine studies. See: Svetlana B. Avrunina, “Russkiye arkhologicheskiye s’yezdy i stanovleniye vizantinovedeniya v Rossii,” *VizVrem* 37 (1976), 255–7.

6 Georgii L. Kurbatov, “V. G. Vasil'yevskiy i nachalo vizantinovedeniya v Peterburgskom universitete,” in *Problemy otechestvennoy i vseobshchey istorii*, ed. Vladimir G. Revunenkov (Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo universiteta, 1969), 135–7.

of his time.<sup>7</sup> Among other texts, he published the *Consilia et Narrationes* by Katakalon Kekaumenos, from the only extant manuscript preserved in the Synodal Library.<sup>8</sup> The first course he taught at St. Petersburg University was on “Sources for the History of the First Crusade” (1870).<sup>9</sup> Another testimony to Vasilievskii’s extensive familiarity with the entire span of scholarship on Byzantine history, starting with the early inklings of interest in this subject in European historical writing, was his historiographical study of Byzantine history, the first of its kind – “A Survey of Works on Byzantine History.”<sup>10</sup>

In the wake of the first edition of “Byzantium and the Pechenegs,” a number of Russian scholars published articles on medieval nomads: Nikolaï Aristov – “On the Land of the Polovtsy,”<sup>11</sup> Platon Burachkov – “A Foray into the Study of the Cumans, or Polovtsy,”<sup>12</sup> and Petro Golubovskii – “On the Uzes and Torks,”<sup>13</sup> among others. Vasilievskii noted such works in the margins of his manuscript (already after the publication of the monograph in 1872), and these marginalia were included by the editors of his collected works in the posthumous edition as notes.<sup>14</sup>

As the full title attests, “Byzantium and the Pechenegs” spans the period from 1048 to 1094/95, that is, from the settlement of Kegen’s Pechenegs in Byzantium and until the Cuman campaign with “Leo” Pseudo-Diogenes<sup>15</sup> against Byzantium. But Vasilievskii also touches on events relating to the

- 
- 7 Lora A. Gerdt, “V. G. Vasil’evskiy: Portret uchenogo v svete yego neizdannoy perezpiski,” in *Rukopisnoye nasledie russkikh vizantinistov v arkhivakh Sankt-Peterburga*, ed. Igor’ P. Medvedev (Saint Petersburg: Dmitriy Bulanin, 1999), 63–4.
- 8 Vasilii G. Vasilievskii, “Sovety i rasskazy vizantiyskogo boyarina XI veka,” *ZhMNP* 215 (1881) no. 6, 242–99; 216 (1881), no. 7, 102–71; 216 (1881), no. 8, 316–57.
- 9 Mikhail A. Zaborov, “Iz istorii izucheniya krestovyykh pokhodov v otechestvennoy medievistike. (‘Krestovyye pokhody’. Kurs lektsiy O.A. Dobiash-Rozhdestvenskoy),” in *Istoriya i istoriki. Istoriografiya vseobshchey istorii*, eds. Mikhail A. Alpatov et al. (Moscow: Nauka, 1966), 344.
- 10 Vasilii G. Vasilievskii, “Obozreniye trudov po vizantiyskoy istorii,” *ZhMNP* 250 (1887), no. 1, 222–65; 252 (1887), no. 7, 113–47; 252 (1887) no. 9, 97–153; 259 (1888), no. 9, 98–173; 266 (1889), no. 12, 380–92.
- 11 Nikolaï A. Aristov, *O Zemle Polovetskoy: Istoriko-geograficheskiy ocherk* (Kyiv: V.I. Davydenko, 1877).
- 12 Platon O. Burachkov, “Opyt izslédovaniya o Kumanakh ili Polovtsakh,” *ZOOID* 10 (1877), 111–36.
- 13 Petro V. Golubovskii, “Ob uzakh i torkakh,” *ZhMNP* 234 (1884), no. 7, 1–21.
- 14 “Predisloviye,” in *Trudy V. G. Vasil’evskago*, 1, iv.
- 15 Peter Frankopan believes that the pretender really was a son of Romanos IV: Peter Frankopan, “Unravelling the Alexiad: Who Was ‘Devgenevich’ of the Russian Primary Chronicle and ‘Pseudo-Diogenes’ of the Greek sources?” *BMGs* 29 (2005), no. 2, 147–66.

raiding of the imperial lands by the Pechenegs after 1026, as well as (in the appendices) those from the reign of Alexios I Komnenos (after 1096).

Of the seven parts of the book, the first gives a general overview of the state of the empire after the death of Basil II and examines descriptions of the Turkic nomads of the North Pontic steppes in Greek and Western sources. Parts two and three deal chronologically with the events of 1048–78, describing the empire's struggle against the Pechenegs and Uzes, its attempts to use them as *foederati* and baptize them, as well as the Pecheneg and Cuman participation in the internecine struggles of 1077–78 between several contenders for the imperial throne.

In part four, Vasilievskii stresses the common ethnic roots of the trans-Danubian Turkic nomads with the Seljuk Turks, and, in underscoring the commonality of action between the two Turkic branches, enumerates the military achievements of the Turks of Asia Minor.<sup>16</sup> Among the active participants in the events of the 11th century in the European provinces of Byzantium, he names the so-called *Dunayskaya vol'nitsa* (Danubian outlaws) – a mixture of the remains of Turkic tribes and the local Slavic population along the Danube, including the Rus', which in his view were numerous there.<sup>17</sup>

Vasilievskii connects the large-scale disturbances in the Danubian region in 1074, which then continued almost until the end of the 11th century, with the harsh fiscal policies of Michael VII.<sup>18</sup> He draws the readers' attention to the emperor's appeal to the West for assistance, and surmises that similar appeals might have been made to the princes of Rus'.<sup>19</sup>

The central arguments of the book are laid out in parts five to seven. As the powerful West gradually began to realize the extent of the problems that beset the capital of Eastern Christianity, the latter's nomadic enemies were gaining strength. A Pecheneg-Seljuk coalition was formed, with the goal of capturing Constantinople.<sup>20</sup> The inhabitants of the Byzantine capital were so frightened that they did not dare venture outside the city walls, even on big feast days.<sup>21</sup> Citing the testimony of Anna, the emperor's daughter, Vasilievskii pictures Alexios I Komnenos frantically sending out requests for help and raising funds to hire more troops. Even the ecclesiastical disagreements with the West paled in the face of the Turkic threat – in Vasilievskii's view, in order to secure foreign aid against the Pechenegs the basileus was prepared to go as far as a union

16 Vasilievskii, "Vizantiya i pechenēgi (1048–1094)," 30.

17 *Ibid.*, 32.

18 *Ibid.*, 34–5.

19 *Ibid.*, 36–8.

20 *Ibid.*, 62–6.

21 *Ibid.*, 72.

between the Eastern and Western churches. To prove this, Vasilievskii sketches out a broad canvas of theological arguments, drawing on the Byzantine and Latin religious literature of the period.<sup>22</sup> It becomes the main subject of part six of the work, together with Alexios' letter to Robert, count of Flanders, urging immediate assistance against the Pechenegs and Seljuks. This letter was a subject of considerable scholarly controversy as early as the mid-19th century.<sup>23</sup>

It is at this point that Vasilievskii introduces the idea that Alexios Komnenos' appeal to the West, transmitted via Robert of Flanders, became one of the main incentives for the launching of the First Crusade.

The entire book is structured to prove this thesis. Vasilievskii meticulously describes all the horrors of the Pecheneg, Uz, and Cuman raids on Byzantium and highlights the part the nomads played in the local disturbances in the empire's Balkan provinces. He repeatedly stresses the inability of even the best Byzantine generals to contain the threat coming from the trans-Danubian Turks. He also highlights the ethnic affinity of the Pechenegs, Uzes, Cumans, and Seljuk Turks and the significant role of the mixed-population towns along the Danube. This borderland population, in his view, was a committed ally of the nomads. Faced with such a grave danger, which became particularly acute in 1091, Alexios Komnenos was forced to turn to the West, to Rus', and to the Cumans. Placing most of his hope in obtaining assistance from the West, the emperor even agreed to make certain concessions to the Latins on religious issues.<sup>24</sup> Meanwhile, the West was organizing a crusade, which had goals of its own, most importantly the liberation of the Holy Sepulchre. The Byzantine emperor's appeal sped up the preparations.<sup>25</sup> Robert of Flanders became the spokesman for the emperor in the latter's pleas to the West for help. In Vasilievskii's description, the count exerted a powerful influence on other European rulers because of his dynastic ties and reputation.<sup>26</sup>

In many respects, Vasilievskii's "Byzantium and the Pechenegs" resembles a theatrical play. If part six is the culmination, then part seven is the denouement. It paints a picture of the decisive battle between the Byzantine army and its allies, namely Cumans under the command of Boniak and Tugorkhan and a five-thousand-strong force of "highlanders" on the one hand, and the Pechenegs on the other, which took place on 29 April 1091 in the valley of

22 Ibid., 84–9.

23 On this letter, see Einar Joranson, "The Problem of the Spurious Letter of Emperor Alexios to the Court of Flanders," *The American Historical Review* 55 (1950), no. 4, 811–32.

24 Vasilievskii, "Vizantiya i pechenēgi (1048–1094)," 90.

25 Ibid., 93.

26 Ibid., 94–5.

the river Hebrus (Maritsa).<sup>27</sup> Vasilievskii also describes the last incursion of the trans-Danubian Turks into Byzantium in the 11th century – the Cuman raid with Pseudo-Diogenes on Constantinople.<sup>28</sup> Concluding the main part of the work, he attempts to explain why the crusade began in 1095 rather than 1091,<sup>29</sup> and to connect the “five-thousand-strong force of highlanders” with the Rus’ army of Prince Vasilko Rostislavovich.<sup>30</sup>

The intention of “Byzantium and the Pechenegs” was to demonstrate the important role of the nomads of the North Pontic littoral in the history of Byzantium and Europe in general. This would bring the history of Eastern Europe, including Rus’, closer to that of Western Europe and show their essential unity and interdependence. By way of the First Crusade, the history of Byzantium would become part of the history of the West.

There are two interrelated components at work in the book – the scholarly and the doctrinal. On the one hand, drawing on a broad range of sources, Vasilievskii considers an important period in the history of Byzantium, brings to light the empire’s relations with the Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans in the second half of the 11th century, explores the everyday life of the nomads and

27 Ibid., 101–3. This encounter is known as “the Battle of Levounion (Lebounion)” in Western historiography. Peter Soustal proposes to locate it in the vicinity of the town of Enez (Turkey): Peter Soustal, *Thrakien (Thrakē, Rodopē und Hainimontos)* (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1991), 333.

28 Vasilievskii, “Vizantiya i pechenēgi (1048–1094),” 100–17.

29 Ibid., 107.

30 Ibid., 101–2. The author’s tireless search for a “Rus’ footprint” in various events is another indication that the ultimate goal of the work was to connect the First Crusade and the entirety of developments in Southeastern Europe with the history of medieval Rus’. For instance, when describing the consequences of the defeat of the Uzes and their subsequent resettlement, Attaliates writes that some of them were settled in the domain of *Μυρμιδόνων ἄρχον*. Vasilievskii sees in him (the *archon*) a Rus’ prince: Vasilievskii, “Vizantiya i pechenēgi (1048–1094),” 29. Golubovskii and Rasovskii concur: Petro V. Golubovskii, *Pechenegi, torki i polovtsy do nashestviya tatar. Istoriya yuzhnorusskikh stepey IX–XIII vv.* (Kyiv: Universitetskaya tipografiya I.I. Zavadskogo, 1884), 48; Dmitrii A. Rasovskii, “Pechenegi, torki i berendei na Rusi i v Ugrii,” *СК* 6 (1933), 9. Spinei also accepts this idea without reservations: Victor Spinei, *The Romanians and the Turkic Nomads*, 14. Moravcsik notes that by *Μυρμιδόνες* other Byzantine texts meant Bulgarians (Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, 2, 207). Shepard identifies this potentate as Hungarian: Jonathan Shepard, “Byzantium and the Steppe-Nomads: The Hungarian Dimension,” in *Byzanz und Ostmitteleuropa 950–1453*, 66. It is possible that the threat posed to Byzantium by the Pechenegs and Cumans (successfully defeated by Alexios Komnenos) was somewhat exaggerated by the emperor’s daughter, the author of the *Alexiad* (on this, see an article by Larisa Vilimonović: Larisa Vilimonović, “Deconstructing the Narrative, Constructing a Meaning: Why Was the *Alexiad* Written?” *ZRV* 52 (2015), 207–35). And Vasilievskii, in his turn, succumbed to the influence of this source.



to some extent their religious beliefs, and makes important advances in the understanding of the genesis of the First Crusade and in the critical study of sources for Byzantine history. This is why “Byzantium and the Pechenegs” remained for a long time a key work in the field.<sup>31</sup>

On the other hand, one cannot help but notice that Vasilevskii, well aware that the history of Byzantium’s relations with the Pechenegs began long before 1048 and ended later than 1091, set rather narrow chronological boundaries for his study. Its title notwithstanding, the Pechenegs play only a tertiary role in Vasilevskii’s “Byzantium and the Pechenegs.” The author glosses over significant episodes in their relations with the empire and does not give much attention to their baptism, their life within the imperial borders, or their dealings with the local population. Only the Pechenegs’ raiding activities are examined in depth. At the same time, Vasilevskii accentuates the role of Rus’ as the power that restrained “the wild hordes.”<sup>32</sup> Boris Grekov, a leading light of Stalinist imperialist scholarship, was straightforward in his assessment: “Studying the history of the Pechenegs and Cumans in more detail will likely throw new light on Byzantium’s stance toward the princes of Rus’ – that is what Vasilevskii thought when he was writing his work ‘Byzantium and the Pechenegs.’”<sup>33</sup> Rus’ (and its ethnic constituent, the “Rus’ population”) acts in the book as an antagonist of the Steppe in general, as a military power Byzantine emperors could count on in repelling nomadic attacks, and as a component of “the Danubian outlaws” – free settlers who, together with the nomads, continually harassed the imperial provinces. To give more weight to the role of Rus’ in fending off the danger Byzantium faced from the Steppe,

31 In a 1978 article, Vasilka Tŭpkova-Zaimova observes that “Vasilevskii’s ‘Byzantium and the Pechenegs’ remains the foremost work on the Pechenegs”: Vasilka Tŭpkova-Zaimova, “Tyurkskiye kochevniky, vizantiyskaya administratsiya i mestnoye naseleniye na Nizhnem Dunaye (XI–XII vv.),” in *Vostochnaya Yevropa v drevnosti i srednevekov’ye*, ed. Lev V. Cherepnin (Moscow: Nauka, 1978), 68. Vasilevskii’s treatments of other historiographical problems also have not lost their significance. See: Alexandr Nazarenko, “Put’ iz nemets v khazary’ v pervyye veka drevnerusskoy istorii,” in *Vneshnyaya politika Drevney Rusi. Yubileynyye chteniya, posvyashchennyye 70-letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya chlen-korr. AN SSSR V.T. Pashuto*, ed. Anatolii P. Novosel’tsev (Moscow: Institut istorii SSSR, 1988), 55.

32 See, for instance, Vasilevskii, “Vizantiya i pechenęgi (1048–1094),” 37–8, 76, 101–2. Vasilevskii did not pioneer this traditional interpretation of the relations with the Steppe, which dominated Russian historiography in the 19th and early 20th century (*Kiyevskaya Rus’ i kochevniky*, 11–8); Valeri Stoyanov, *Kumanologiya. Opiti za rekonstruktsiya* (Sofia: Akademichno izdatelstvo “Prof. Marin Drinov,” 2006), 40–2; Idem, “Die russische Historiographie über die *Kočevniki* – ein Beitrag zur Ideengeschichte des späten Zarenreichs,” *BHR* 40 (2010), no. 3–4, 167–92.

33 Boris D. Grekov, “Istoriya drevnikh slavyan i Rusi v rabotakh akad. V.G. Vasil’yevskogo,” in *VDI* (1939), no. 1, 341.

Vasilievskii puts forward two hypotheses: that Michael VII might have asked the Kyivan prince Sviatoslav II Yaroslavich for assistance,<sup>34</sup> and that the five-thousand-strong force that helped Alexios I defeat the Pechenegs in the Battle of the Hebrus River belonged to Vasilko Rostislavovich, Prince of Terebovlia.<sup>35</sup>

In “Byzantium and the Pechenegs,” Vasilievskii follows the lead of the founder of Russian medieval studies Timofei Granovskii (1813–55), who saw the Slavs as a supporting pillar of the Byzantine Empire and linked the empire’s collapse to changes in its relationship with the Slavic population.<sup>36</sup> Moreover, the saviors of Byzantium in 1091 were the Cumans Boniak and Tugorkhan, both “Russified,” in a way, due to their presence in a Rus’ chronicle and in the history of Rus’.<sup>37</sup> Boris Grekov, in his enthusiastic article on Vasilievskii’s contribution to Slavic history, characterized Boniak and Tugorkhan as “the Cuman khans well known to our chronicles.”<sup>38</sup> Thus, bringing Western and Eastern Europe

- 
- 34 Vasilievskii, “Vizantiya i pechenęgi (1048–1094),” 37–8. He published an article on this question: Vasilii G. Vasilievskii, “Dva pis’ma vizantiyskogo imperatora Mikhaila VII Duki k Vsevolodu Yaroslavovichu,” in *Trudy V. G. Vasil’evskogo*, 2, 3–55. As observed by Athina Kolia-Dermitzaki, “Sathas recognized Robert Guiscard as the addressee of these untitled letters, an opinion which is now considered as indisputable”: Athina Kolia-Dermitzaki, “Michael VII Doukas, Robert Guiscard, and the Byzantine-Norman Marriage Negotiations,” *BS* 58, (1997), no. 2, 253.
- 35 Vasilievskii, “Vizantiya i pechenęgi (1048–1094),” 101–2. Vasil Zlatarski considered these “highlanders” Bulgarian: Vasil Zlatarski, *Istoriya na bŭlgarskata dŭrzhava prez Srednite vekove*, vol. 2, *Bŭlgariya pod Vizantiisko vladichestvo (1018–1187)* (Sofia: Dŭrzhavna pečatnitsa, 1934), 500–3. Nicolae Bănescu saw them as local inhabitants, “Bewohner der Halbinsel”: Nicolae Bănescu, “Ein ethnographisches Problem am Unterlauf der Dunau,” *Byzantion* 6 (1931), 305.
- 36 Mikhail V. Alpatov, “Trudy T.N. Granovskogo,” in *Ocherki istorii istoricheskoy nauki v SSSR*, vol. 1, eds. Mikhail N. Tikhomirov et al. (Moscow: Izdatel’stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1955), 443.
- 37 Vasilievskii, “Vizantiya i pechenęgi (1048–1094),” 96 and 98.
- 38 Boris D. Grekov, “Istoriya drevnikh slavyan i Rusi v rabotakh akad. V.G. Vasil’evskogo,” 344. After the Russian army put down a Nogai rebellion in 1783, the Nogais were forced to leave the region north of the Black Sea – approximately 500,000 of them moved to Turkey and a large number relocated to the North Caucasus. In 1806–12, the Russian army eradicated the Budzhak Horde. According to the census of 1827, only five Turks and no Tatars or Nogais lived in the area. See: *Statisticheskoye opisaniye Bessarabii sobstvenno tak nazyvayemoy, ili Budzhaka/S prilozheniyem general’nogo plana yego kraya, sostavlennoho pri grazhdanskoy s’yemke Bessarabii, proizvodivshey po Vysochayshemu poveleniyyu razmezhevaniye zemel’ onoy na uchastki s 1822 po 1828-y g.* (Akherman: Tipografiya I.M. Grinshteyna, 1899), 13. By 1864–65, the Russian Empire had generally completed the occupation of Central Asia. The land grab was accompanied by a symbolic “appropriation of history” – the nomads of Eurasia from the Pacific Ocean to the Black Sea were becoming “ours.” The steppes of the North Pontic littoral, conquered by the Russian Empire in the 18th century after the expulsion and extermination of the Nogais, began to be called “South Russian

closer together with the help of the Pechenegs and Cumans, the scholar put Rus', "the Rus' steppes," and "Rus' nomads" to the forefront of the narrative and denied the nomads as such any significance as an independent factor in the history of Eastern Europe. From this perspective, "Byzantium and the Pechenegs" was part of the Russian colonialist discourse.<sup>39</sup>

From the time of the French historian Louis Chantereau Le Febvre (1588–1658), substantiation of territorial claims was an important mission of historians in early modern and modern Europe. Muscovite and Russian historical writing was no exception. *The Chronicler of the Beginning of the Realm*, a historical source originating in mid-16th-century Moscow, notes that Prince Ivan IV justified his pretensions to the city of Astrakhan by claiming that it used to be called Tmutarakan, and that Grand Prince Volodimir passed it on to his son Mstislav.<sup>40</sup>

Every empire in history has had a certain ideal horizon of imperial expansion, always broader than the national state.<sup>41</sup> The idea of taking possession of Istanbul and the straits between the Black Sea and Mediterranean entered Russia's imperial horizon as early as the 17th century, but it took its final shape only in 1782, in a letter from the empress of Russia Catherine II to the kaiser of Austria Joseph II.<sup>42</sup> The question of the full control of the Black Sea Straits, or at least free passage for its merchant fleet and warships, was of great economic and military interest to Russia.<sup>43</sup> While during the 1830s and 1840s Russian warships moved freely through the straits and Russian trade out of the Black

---

steppes" in Russian (and Soviet) academic literature. Note, for instance, such book titles as Petro Golubovskii's *Pechenegi, torki i polovtsy do nashestviya tatar. Istoriya yuzhnorusskikh stepey IX–XIII vv.*, Svetlana Pletnyova's *Kochevniki yuzhnorusskikh stepey v epokhu srednekov'ya (IV–XIII veka)* (Voronezh: Izdatel'stvo Voronezhskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, 2003), or Igor' Knyaz'kii's *Vizantiya i kochevniki yuzhnorusskikh stepey*.

- 39 Mykola Melnyk, "Rosiy's'ka i radyans'ka istoriohrafyia stosunkiv Vizantiyi i kochivnykiv Pivnichnoho Prychornomor'ya yak kolonial'nyy dyskurs: do postanovky problemy," *Naukovi zapysky Natsional'noho universytetu "Ostroz'ka akademiya."* *Istorychni nauky. Na poshanu profesora Mykoly Koval's'koho* (2004), no. 4, 96–9.
- 40 Andrei O. Amelkin, "Problema Tmutorokanskogo knyazhestva v istoricheskoy mysli dopeetrovskoy Rossii," in *Vostochnaya Yevropa v drevnosti i srednekov'ye. Mnimyye real'nosti v antichnoy i srednekovoy istoriografii*, ed. Yelena A. Mel'nikova (Moscow: Institut vseobshchey istorii RAN, 2002), 4.
- 41 See: Alexandr F. Filippov, "Nablyudatel' imperii (imperiya kak ponyatiye sotsiologii i politicheskaya problema)," *Voprosy sotsiologii* (1992), no. 1, 89–120.
- 42 Andrei L. Zorin, *Kormya dvuglavogo orla ... Literatura i gosudarstvennaya ideologiya v Rossii v posledney treti XVIII – pervoy treti XIX veka* (Moscow: Novoye literaturnoye obozreniye, 2004), 33 and 35.
- 43 See: *Rossiya i Chernomorskiye prolivy (XVIII–XX stoletiya)*, eds. Leonid N. Nezhinskiy and Andrei V. Ignat'iev (Moscow: Mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya, 1999).

Sea was experiencing a period of rapid growth,<sup>44</sup> the Crimean War (1853–56) changed that. The Russian navy was barred from entering the straits in peacetime and all Russian naval bases on the Black Sea were liquidated following the Treaty of Paris, signed in 1856. From then on, the diplomatic and military efforts of the Russian state were aimed at overcoming the negative consequences of the Crimean War for the Russian Empire.

Russian literature<sup>45</sup> and historical scholarship<sup>46</sup> could not maintain detachment from their country's imperial ambitions.<sup>47</sup> Vasilii Vasilievskii was no exception. In addition to "Byzantium and the Pechenegs," an echo of Russia's claims to domination on the Black Sea is palpable in his *Russian-Byzantine*

44 A lion's share of the Russian Empire's main export, grain, was transported via this route: Yelena P. Kudriavtseva, Vladimir N. Ponomarev, "Zakrytiye Prolivov dlya voyennykh sudov ot Londonskikh konventsiy do Berlinskogo traktata (1840–1878 gg.)," in *Rossiia i Chernomorskiye prolivy (XVIII–XX stolet'ya)*, 123.

45 On the reflection and imperial interpretation of historical events in Russian fiction see, for instance, Zorin, *Kormya dvuglavogo orla...*

46 Having annexed extensive territories in the late 18th and 19th centuries (including Right-Bank Ukraine, Bessarabia, Crimea, and the North Caucasus), Russia tried to "historically" validate the possession of these lands. For example, during the Prut River campaign of 1711, Tsar Peter I cast himself as "the liberator of the Balkan Christians," which later led to the emergence of the pan-Slavic cultural theory in Russian historical and philosophical writing. See: Jackson Little, "The Slavic Kalabalik: the Prut Campaign, Charles XII's Swedish Camp at Bender and the Rise of Pan-Slavism (A Theory on Peter I's Campaign in Wallachia, Moldova and Its Legacy)," *Tyragetia* 7 (22) (2013), no. 2, 111–14. Very soon after the conquest of Crimea, the so-called Stone of Tmutarakan was miraculously found, which was to make clear that "Ancient Rus'" had dominated both sides of the Kerch Strait (see: Brian J. Boeck, "A Tale of Two Stones: Comparing Contested Epigraphic Artifacts from Kensington Minnesota and Kievan Rus'," *Russian History* 32 (2005), no. 3/4, 297–312). In 1840, the supervisor of the Kyiv school district wrote to the Minister of Popular Enlightenment that "the preservation of Rus' antiquities in the western provinces" would serve as "the obvious proof of the empire's right to possess the country that long ago belonged to the stock of St Vladimir": Oleg I. Zhurba, *Kyyiv's'ka arkhoehrafichna komis-iya. 1843-1921. Narys istoriyi i diyal'nosti* (Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1993), 132. On the eve of World War I, the Russian historian and geographer Sergeĭ Seredonin wrote that before the Hungarian invasion, Eastern Slavs (that is, the foundational substrate of Russian statehood) inhabited the area of today's Eger and the river Sajó (see: Mikhail K. Yurasov, "Mesto rusinov v ento-politicheskoy strukture Vengrii v X v.," in *Vostochnaya Yevropa v drevnosti i srednevekov'ye. Ranniye gosudarstva Yevropy i Azii: problemy politogeneza. XXIII Chteniya pamyati V. T. Pashuto*, ed. Yelena A. Mel'nikova et al. (Moscow: Institut vseobshchey istorii RAN, 2011), 339).

47 On Russian Orientalism, see David Schimmelpenninck van der Oye, *Russian Orientalism: Asia in the Russian Mind from Peter the Great to the Emigration* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010); Vera Tolz, *Russia's Own Orient: The Politics of Identity and Oriental Studies in the Late Imperial and Early Soviet Periods* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011).

*Studies: The Lives of Saint George of Amastris and Saint Stephen of Surozh*, published on the eve of and during a new Russo-Turkish war in 1915.<sup>48</sup>

Russian historical scholarship of the last third of the 19th and first half of the 20th centuries lauded precisely this doctrinal component of “Byzantium and the Pechenegs,” often ignoring its scholarly contribution. According to Fëdor Uspenskiĭ, after the book’s publication Konstantin Bestuzhev-Ryumin (1829–97) urged all Russian historians to emulate it, because this was what Byzantine studies could do for Russian history.<sup>49</sup>

Vasilievskii’s idea that the North Pontic nomads’ push into Byzantium forced the latter to seek help in the West, which eventually led to the First Crusade, found support in Russian and, initially, Soviet historiography. Yulian Kulakovskii, Fëdor Uspenskiĭ, Alexander Vasiliev, Mitrofan Levchenko, and Boris Grekov all generally followed Vasilievskii’s scheme in their works.<sup>50</sup>

From the 1930s to 1950s, chauvinistic Soviet historiography accepted with enthusiasm not only Vasilievskii’s thesis on the genesis of the First Crusade in general, but also two of his hypotheses in particular, namely regarding the letters from Michael VII Doukas to Vsevolod Yaroslavovich and the participation of Vasilko Rostislavovich’s five-thousand-strong force of “highlanders” in the defeat of the Pechenegs in 1091.<sup>51</sup>

48 Vasilii G. Vasilievskii, “Russko-vizantiyskiye issledovaniya: Zhitiya sv. Georgiya Amastridskogo i Stefana Surozhskogo,” in *Trudy V. G. Vasil'yevskogo*, vol. 3 (Petrograd: Izdaniye Imperatorskoy Akademii nauk, 1915). One chapter is even entitled “On the Russian Name and Russian Invasion.” The attacks of the Rus’ on Σουδαία in Crimea and Ἰμαστροίς in Paphlagonia as early as the 9th century were to demonstrate a thousand-year history of “the Russian arms” successes in the Black Sea region.

49 Fëdor I. Uspenskiĭ, “Akademik Vasilii Grigoriyevich Vasil'yevskiy. (Obzor glavneyshikh trudov yego po izucheniyu Vizantii),” *ZhMNP* 325 (1899), no. 10, 294. Uspenskiĭ highly valued the accomplishment of “Byzantium and the Pechenegs” in connecting Byzantine and general European history, as well as Vasilievskii’s thesis about a coordination between the Pechenegs and Seljuks in their attacks on Byzantium: *Ibid.*, 295–6. He used the latter idea in his own work *Kak voznik i razvivalsya v Rossii vostochnyy vopros* (Saint Petersburg: Sankt-Peterburgskoye slavyanskoye blagotvoritel'noye obshchestvo, 1887), 4.

50 Yulian A. Kulakovskii, *Proshloye Tavridy* (Kyiv: Tipolitografiya Tovarishchestva I.N. Kushnerev, 1906), 166; Fëdor I. Uspenskiĭ, *Istoriya krestovyykh pokhodov* (Saint Petersburg: Tipografiya AO Brokgauz-Yefron, 1901), 5 and 10; Idem, *Istoriya Vizantiyskoy imperii*, vol. 3 (Moscow/Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1948), 78–82, 139; Alexandr A. Vasiliev, *Vizantiya i krestonostsy. Epokha Komninov (1081–1185) i Angelov (1185–1204)* (Petrograd, 1923), 28; Mitrofan V. Levchenko, *Istoriya Vizantii. Kratkiy ocherk (1185–1204)* (Moscow/Leningrad: Sotsekgiz, 1940), 200–202; *Ocherki istorii SSSR. Period feodalizma. IX–XV vv.*, vol. 1, eds. Boris D. Grekov et al. (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1953), 198, 204–5.

51 Boris D. Grekov, *Kiyevskaya Rus'* (Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoye izdatel'stvo politicheskoy literatury, 1953), 468–71; the fact that in 1943, in the thick of World War II, the Soviet

First attempts to question and reconsider some of Vasilevskii's arguments appeared in Russian historiography only as late as the 1920s,<sup>52</sup> and a more thorough revision of his doctrinal position had to wait until the death of Stalin. In 1956, Mitrofan Levchenko published several works challenging Vasilevskii's statements that Michael Doukas' letter was addressed to Prince Vsevolod and that the highlander force in the Battle of the Hebrus River was led by Vasilko Rostislavovich. He also cast doubt on the authenticity of Alexios I's letter to Robert of Flanders.<sup>53</sup> At the same time, Levchenko wrote: "Vasilevskii's work ... showed what a formidable force the Turkic peoples were in the 11th century and what a difficult task it was for Rus' to stand up to the Pecheneg and Cuman power."<sup>54</sup>

Gennadii Litavrin's pivotal study *Bulgaria and Byzantium in the 11th and 12th Centuries*<sup>55</sup> and the Soviet delegation's contribution at the 13th Congress of Byzantine Studies in Oxford<sup>56</sup> marked Soviet scholarship's disavowal of some of Vasilevskii's doctrinal tenets. In the 1950s and 1960s, Mikhail Zaborov published several works on the historiography of the Crusades, in which he offered an ambiguous assessment of "Byzantium and the Pechenegs." On the one hand, Zaborov stressed that the book succeeded in showing the entire system of international relations before the First Crusade in a new light, uncovering additional motives for it as well as illuminating the interdependency of historical developments in Eastern and Western Europe and their mutual influence.<sup>57</sup> On the other hand, he placed Vasilevskii's study among the works

---

scholar Nikolai Lebedev wrote a monograph about him is, to an extent, a testimony to the importance of Vasilevskii's doctrinal principles for the Soviet historical scholarship of the Stalinist era: "V Akademii Nauk SSSR," *Vestnik Akademii Nauk SSSR* (1944), no. 7–8, 113.

52 Vasiliĭ D. Smirnov, "Chto takoye Tmutarakan'," *VizVrem* 23 (1923), no. 1, 29.

53 Mitrofan V. Levchenko, *Ocherki po istorii russko-vizantiyskikh otnosheniy* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1956), 407–410, 427; Idem, "Problema russko-vizantiyskikh otnosheniy v russkoy dorevolutsionnoy, zarubezhnoy i sovetskoy istoriografii," *VizVrem* 8 (1956), 11.

54 *Ibid.*, 12

55 Gennadiĭ G. Litavrin, *Bolgariya i Vizantiya v XI–XII vv.* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1960). Litavrin did, however, allow for the possibility that Rus' settlers were present on the Danube in the 11th century: *Ibid.*, 419.

56 Gennadiĭ G. Litavrin and Alexandr P. Kazhdan, "Ekonomicheskiye i politicheskiye otnosheniya Drevney Rusi i Vizantii v XI–XII vv.," in *The Proceedings of the XIIIth International Congress*, 69–81.

57 Mikhail A. Zaborov, "Krestovyye pokhody v russkoy burzhuaznoy istoriografii," *VizVrem* 4 (1951), 174–5.

that provided a justification for the assertive policies of the Russian autocratic regime in the Balkans in the last third of the 19th century.<sup>58</sup>

Unlike the doctrinal, the scholarly component of “Byzantium and the Pechenegs” long remained unchallenged. Among Russian historians, the subject was considered so well studied that neither Uspenskiĭ nor Litavrin nor Bibikov felt the need to revisit it. Thus, Uspenskiĭ picked a subject – nomadic migrations from Asia to Europe – that in fact complemented Vasilievskiĭ’s work; but he focused only on the Seljuk Turks and Mongols, passing over the nomads dealt with by Vasilievskiĭ.<sup>59</sup> Bibikov picked up chronologically where “Byzantium and the Pechenegs” had left off, examining Byzantium’s relations with the trans-Danubian nomads in the 12th and 13th centuries.<sup>60</sup> Today, the Russian historians Irina Konovalova and Valeriĭ Perkhavko continue to work on the problems of the “Rus’” origins of the inhabitants of the Danubian towns and the influence of Rus’ in the Danubian region in general.<sup>61</sup>

Evaluating “Byzantium and the Pechenegs,” we should keep in mind that this was one of the first works devoted to a specific fragment of the history of Byzantium not only in Russian historiography, but also in Byzantine studies as a whole. Considered from the point of view of Thomas Kuhn’s model of the historical development of science and scholarship, Byzantine studies in the mid-19th century were going through the phase of paradigm formation. For a number of reasons, “Byzantium and the Pechenegs” became a paradigm-setting work for its field. Vasilievskiĭ was the first scholar to use the accumulated theoretical accomplishments of Byzantine studies, which until the mid-19th century had limited themselves mostly to the identification, criticism, and publication of Byzantine sources, to address a chronologically, geographically, and even “ethnically” specific problem. “Byzantium and the Pechenegs” became a kind of template for other scholars. At the same time, this work in a way prefigured the fate of the study of relations between Byzantium and trans-Danubian nomads: paradoxically, this subject, involving an empire that had disappeared and nomadic peoples that had dissolved in

58 Idem, “Krestovyye pokhody v russkoy istoriografii posledney treti XIX v.,” *VizVrem* 22 (1963), 227–8; Idem, *Istoriografiya krestovyykh pokhodov (XV–XIX vv.)* (Moscow: Nauka, 1971), 335–6.

59 Födor I. Uspenskiĭ, “Dvizheniye narodov iz Tsentral’noy Azii v Yevropu. I. Turki. II. Mongoly,” *VizVrem* 1 (1947), 9–28.

60 Mikhail V. Bibikov, “Iz istorii Nizhnego Podunav’ya v X–XII vv.,” *Sovetskoye slavyanovedeniye* (1979), no. 1, 104–5; Idem, “Bolgariya, Rus’, Vizantiya, polovtsy v sisteme mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniy v Yugo-Vostochnoy Yevrope XII – pervoy poloviny XIII vv.,” in *Rusko-bŭlgarski vrŭzki*, 91–106.

61 Irina G. Konovalova and Valeriĭ B. Perkhavko, *Drevnyaya Rus’ i Nizhneye Podunav’ye* (Moscow: Pamyatniki istoricheskoy mysli, 2000).

the sea of “historic” ethnic groups, became hostage to the political agendas of various national historiographies.

## 2 Byzantium and the Nomads of the North Pontic Steppes in European Historiography, Mid-19th to Mid-20th Centuries

August Ludwig von Schlözer is seen as the author of the idea of grouping nations by language rather than according to biblical or classical principles.<sup>62</sup> He also produced one of the first essays on the Pechenegs and Cumans.<sup>63</sup>

In Moravcsik’s bibliography of works on the Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans, compiled for the second edition of *Byzantinoturcica* (1958), studies of Byzantium’s relations with trans-Danubian nomads make up no more than 7 percent of the total; linguistic studies – 13 percent; source criticism – 29 percent; and works on the history of nomads in the lands that would become Romania, Hungary, Ukraine, and Bulgaria – 20 percent. The lion’s share of the entries (31 percent) deals with these nomadic peoples in general. Moravcsik’s bibliography covers the period from the mid-19th to the mid-20th century, which can be broken down into three phases based on broad changes in the focus and direction of research.

During the first phase (from the middle to the beginning of the last third of the 19th century) historians mostly studied the history of nomads in individual countries or territories, drawing on “local” written sources – for instance, early Rus’ chronicles in Russia. The second phase, which continued until the early 1920s, witnessed the broadening of the source base and geographical scope of research. Such sub-fields as source criticism, linguistics, and local studies began to take shape with the publication of first specialized works. Turkic studies split from general Oriental studies. Early shoots of medieval archaeology appeared. The range of known written sources (including Oriental ones) was established almost definitively. The third phase (1920s to 1940s) unfolded as new states were taking shape in Eastern and Southeastern Europe, borders were changing in the aftermath of World War I, and national historiographies were flourishing. This stage was marked by a kind of “battle for the Middle Ages,” as historians in the new European countries tried to justify the

62 Han F. Vermeulen, *Before Boas: The Genesis of Ethnography and Ethnology in the German Enlightenment* (Lincoln/London: University of Nebraska Press, 2015), 289. See also: Günter Mühlpfordt, “Völkergeschichte statt Fürstenhistorie – Schlözer als Begründer der kritisch-ethnischen Geschichtsforschung,” *Jahrbuch für Geschichte* 25 (1982), 23–72.

63 August Ludwig von Schlözer, *Kritische Sammlungen zur Geschichte der Deutschen in Siebenbürgen*, vol. 2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck-Ruprecht, 1796), 222–5.



right of their own particular nation to this or that piece of territory by discovering “their” ethnic states or autochthonous populations there at some point in history. This struggle encouraged closer attention to the body of already familiar sources and pushed scholars to search for new ones.

### 2.1 *Historical Writing in the Russian Empire before 1917*

Given that the Pechenegs, Uzes (Torki), and Cumans (Polovtsi) are repeatedly mentioned in the *Primary Chronicle*, interest towards the history of these peoples in Russian and Ukrainian historiography is natural. Grygoriï Grabianka, Alexandr Rigelman, Yakiv Markovych, Dmytro Bantysh-Kamens'kyï, Mikhail Shcherbatov, Ivan Boltin,<sup>64</sup> Vasiliï Tatishchev, Nikolaï Karamzin, Nikolaï Ustrialov, Dmytro Bagaliï, Mikhail Pogodin, Alexandr Gilferding, Sergeï Solovyov, Vasiliï Kliuchevskii, Mykola Kostomarov, and Mykhailo Grushevs'kyi<sup>65</sup> – this is an incomplete list of 18th- and 19th-century historians whose works feature medieval nomads. Nikolaï Aristov, Platon Burachkov, Ivan Beliaev, Ernst-Eduard (in Russian: Arist Aristovich) Kunick, and Ivan Samchevs'kyi wrote special studies on the subject.<sup>66</sup>

In 1884 in Kyiv, Petro Golubovskii (1857–1907) published as a book his master's thesis on *The Pechenegs, Torks, and Cumans before the Tatar Invasion. The History of the South Russian Steppes, 9th to 14th Centuries*.<sup>67</sup> It became a milestone in the historiography of the medieval nomads of Eastern Europe.<sup>68</sup>

64 Nataliya Ye. Minenkova, *Kochovyky Pivdenno-Skhidnoyi Yevropy X – I polovyny XIII st. v ukrayins'kyi i rosiys'kyi istoriohrafiyi* [Candidate's thesis] (Donetsk, 2005), 68–71.

65 *Kiyevskaya Rus' i kochevniki*, 11–36; Peter B. Golden, “Nomads in the Sedentary World: The Case of the Pre-Chinggisid Rus' and Georgia,” in *Nomads in the Sedentary World*, ed. Anatoliï M. Khazanov and Andre Wink (Richmond: Routledge, 2001), 25–8; Peter B. Golden, “Khazar Studies: Achievements and Perspectives,” 19–28.

66 Nikolaï A. Aristov, *O zemle Polovetskoj*; Platon O. Burachkov, “Opyt izslédovaniya o Kumanakh ili Polovtsakh”; Ivan Beliaev, “O severnom berege Chernogo morya i prilozhashchikh k nemu stepyakh, do vodvoreniya v etom kraye mongolov,” *ZOOID* 3 (1853), 3–46; Arist A. Kunick, “O torskikh pechenegakh i polovtsakh po mad'yarskim istochnikam s ukazaniem na noveyshiye issledovaniya o chernomorsko-torskikh narodakh ot Atily do Chingiskhana,” *Uchenyya Zapiski Akadēmii Nauk po pervomu i tret'yemu otdeleniyam* 3 (1855), no. 5, 714–41; Ivan F. Samchevskii, “Torki, Berendei i Chernyye Klobuki,” *Arkhiv istoriko-yuridicheskikh svedeniy otnosyashchikhsya do Rossii, izdavayemyy N. Kalachovym* 2, 1 (1855), no. 3, 83–106.

67 Petro V. Golubovskii, *Pechenegi, torki i polovtsy do nashestviya tatar*; V.A. [ntonovych] “[Review of:] *Pechenegi, torki i polovtsy do nashestviya tatar. Istoriya yuzhnorusskikh stepey IX–XIII vv.*, Kiev, 1884 g.,” *Kiyevskaya Starina* 9 (1884), no. 7, 505–8.

68 *Kiyevskaya Rus' i kochevniki*, 20; Serzhan M. Akhinzhanov, *Kypchaki v istorii srednevekovogo Kazakhstana* (Almaty: Gylym, 1995); Stoyanov, *Kumanologiya. Opiti za rekonstruktsiya*, 14, 23 and 36.

Among other things, Golubovskii proved that the “Torks” of the Rus’ chronicles were identical with the Uzes<sup>69</sup> and that the Rus’ name “Polovtsy” denoted the same people as the Western European and Greek term “Cumans” and Oriental “Kipchaks.”<sup>70</sup> He concluded that medieval European chroniclers wrote of three different peoples – the Pechenegs, Torks-Uzes, and Cumans. Later, Golubovskii completed a study on “The Cumans in Hungary.”<sup>71</sup> This essay is notable for its thorough analysis of Hungarian historiography.<sup>72</sup>

The question of relations between settled and nomadic populations was raised in the works of Vasilii Grigor'yev, Vasil' Liaskorons'kyi, Mikhail Zatyrevich, and Konstantin Grot.<sup>73</sup> Mykhailo Drahomanov (under the pen-name P. Kuzmichevskii) was perhaps the first to turn to ethnographic materials for information about medieval nomads.<sup>74</sup>

69 He dedicated a special article to proving this thesis: Golubovskii, “Ob uzakh i torkakh.”

70 Golubovskii, *Pechenegi, torki i polovtsy do nashestviya tatar*, 64. Confusion in the names of tribes and peoples led to confusion in historiography. Peter Frederik Suhm, for example, identified the Uzes with the Cumans: Peter-Frederik Suhm, “Abhandlung von den Uzen oder Polowzern,” in *Des heiligen Nestors, Mönchs im Petscherischen Kloster des heiligen Theodosius in Kiew, und der Fortsetzer desselben älteste Jahrbücher der Russischen Geschichte: vom Jahre 858 bis zum Jahre 1203*, vol. 4, ed. Johann-Benedikt Scherer (Leipzig: Bernhard Christoph Breitkopf und Sohn, 1774), 271–310. Bulgarian historians of the early 20th century continued to lump together different ethnic groups: Stoyan Dzhansúzov considered the Polovtsi and the Pechenegs to be one people, and the Cumans and the Uzes – another (see: Stoyanov, *Kumanologiya. Opiti za rekonstruktsiya*, 39), while Stefan Mladenov saw no difference between the Uzes and Cumans (Stefan Mladenov, “Pechenegi i uzi-kumani v búlgarskata istoriya,” *Búlgarska istoricheska biblioteka* (1931), no. 4, 113–36).

71 Petro V. Golubovskii, “Polovtsy v Vengrii (Istoricheskiy ocherk),” *Universitetskie izvestiya* 12 (1889), 45–72.

72 For an evaluation of it, see Dmitrii Rasovskii, “Polovtsy,” *SK* 7 (1935), 246. Aside from its properly historiographical significance, it served as a reference work for Russian and later Soviet historians. Since more recent Hungarian historiography on this subject was inaccessible (mostly due to the language barrier), even more than a hundred years after its publication Soviet scholars often mined this essay for information. See, for instance, Igor' Knyazkiĭ, “Polovtsy v Dnestrovsko-Karpatskikh zemlyakh i Nizhnem Podunav'ye v kontse XII – pervykh desyatiletiyakh XIII v.,” in *Sotsial'no-ekonomicheskaya i politicheskaya istoriya Moldavii perioda feodalizma*, ed. Pavel V. Sovetov (Kishinev: Shtiintsa, 1988), 23.

73 Vasilii V. Grigor'ev, “Ob otnosheniyakh mezhdú kochevymi narodami i osedlymi gosudarstvami,” *ZhMNP* 178 (1875), no. 3, 1–27; Vasil' G. Liaskorons'kyi, “Russkiye pokhody v stepi v udel'no-vechevoye vremya i pokhod kn. Vitovta na tatar v 1399 g.,” *ZhMNP* 9 (1907), no. 5, 1–45; Mikhail D. Zatyrevich, *O vliyaniĭ bor'by mezhdú narodami i sosloviyami na obrazovanie stroya russkogo gosudarstva v' domongol'skiy period* (Moscow: Izdaniye Imperatorskogo obshchestva istorii i drevnostey rossiyskikh pri Moskovskom universitete, 1874), 107–35; Konstantin Ya. Grot, *Moraviya i mad'yary. S poloviny IX do nachala X veka* (Saint Petersburg: Izdaniye Imperatorskoy Akademii nauk, 1881), 248–304.

74 P. Kuzmichevskii [pseud. of Mykhailo P. Drahomanov], “Sholudiviy Bunyaka v ukrain-skikh narodnykh skazaniyakh,” *Kiyevskaya Starina* 18 (1887), no. 8, 676–713; 19 (1887), no. 10, 233–76.

A survey of the flagship Russian journal of Byzantine studies *Vizantiiskii Vremennik* (Byzantine Annals)<sup>75</sup> for the years 1894–1916 shows a notable lack of attention on the part of the Russian Byzantinological community to the problems raised in “Byzantium and the Pechenegs.” Only the discussion around the so-called *Toparcha Gothicus* may be of some interest in this respect.<sup>76</sup> In 1899, two works of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus were published in Russian translation for the first time.<sup>77</sup>

In his doctoral dissertation, “The Establishment of the Second Bulgarian Empire,” the Russian Byzantinologist Fëdor Uspenskii<sup>78</sup> (1845–1928) considered the condition of Bulgaria under the Byzantine rule, as well as Byzantium’s relations with trans-Danubian Turks and the role of the Cumans in Balkan history.<sup>79</sup> In another study, he made an overview of the written sources relating to the Byzantine possessions on the north coast of the Black Sea in the 9th and 10th centuries.<sup>80</sup> In 1895, Uspenskii became director of the newly-established Russian Archaeological Institute in Constantinople (РАИК). The work of this research body led, for instance, to the discovery of the so-called

- 
- 75 Vasilievskii was generally considered to be the journal’s founder. However, the actual founder and editor of the *Vizantiiskii Vremennik* was Vasilii Regel’ (1857–1932). His role was quickly forgotten because of his German last name and Protestant (non-Orthodox) faith: Igor’ P. Medvedev, “V.E. Regel’ kak osnovatel’ i redaktor ‘Vizantiyskogo vremennika,’” in *Arkhivny russkikh vizantinistov v Sankt-Peterburge*, ed. Igor’ P. Medvedev (Saint Petersburg: Dmitriy Bulanin, 1995), 158.
- 76 Friedrich F. Westberg, “Zapiska Gotskogo Toparkha,” *VizVrem* 15 (1908), 227–40; A. Bertier De La Garde, “K voprosu o mestonakhozhenii Mavrokastrona Zapiski Gotskago toparkha,” *ZOOID* 33 (1916), 1–20. On this document, published in 1819 by the Parisian Hellenist Karl Benedikt Hase, see: Ihor Ševčenko, “The Date and Author of so-called Fragments of Toparcha Gothicus,” *DOP* 25 (1971), 117–88; Igor’ P. Medvedev, “Excellent Scholar – Excellent Forger: The Case of Karl Benedict Hase,” in *Manufacturing a Past for the Present*, 144–55.
- 77 “Sochineniya Konstantina Bagryanorodnago: O femakh (*De Thematibus*) i o narodakh (*De Administrando Imperio*). S predisloviyem Gavriila Laskina,” *Chteniya v “imperatorskom” obshchestvë Istorii i Drevnostey Rossiyskikh pri Moskovskom Universitetë* (1899), no. 1, 1–263.
- 78 About him: Boris T. Goryanov, “F.I. Uspenskiy i yego znachenije v vizantinovedenii. (K stoletiyu so dnya rozhdeniya: 1845 – 7 fevralya – 1945 g.),” *VizVrem* 1(1947), 29–108.
- 79 Fëdor I. Uspenskii, *Obrazovaniye vtorago Bolgarskago tsarstva* (Odessa, 1879), 75–88. A section of this work was entitled “The Participation of Russians in the Struggle for [Bulgaria’s] Independence” (*Ibid.*, 31–9), which suited the contemporary political situation admirably.
- 80 Fëdor I. Uspenskii, *Vizantiyskiye vladeniya na severnom beregu Chernogo morya v IX i X vv.* (Kyiv, 1889). There was a polemical exchange between Uspenskii and Vasilievskii concerning this work: Fëdor I. Uspenskii, “O mirazhakh, otkrytykh V. Vasil’yevskim,” *ZhMNP* 266 (1889), no. 12, 550–5; Vasilii G. Vasilievskii, “Otvét na stat’yu F.I. Uspenskogo,” *ZhMNP* 266 (1889), no. 12, 555–7.

Ohrid parchment manuscript of Ioannes Skylitzes' *Synopsis of Histories*<sup>81</sup> and medieval clay kettles with inside ears found during excavations at Pliska.<sup>82</sup>

The RAIK was seen as an effective instrument for solving Russia's foreign policy problems.<sup>83</sup> Tackling the issue of relations between the East and West, between Byzantium, the Crusaders, and nomads, first raised by Vasilievskii, Russian historiography began to reflect not only academic concerns, but also the Russian Empire's political interests in the region of the Black Sea Straits. These were the first manifestations of the intimate connection between historical writing and politics that is still evident in scholarship on the history of the Balkans and the Dniester-Danube region.

The writings of Nikolai Skabalanovich (1848–1918) are notable for closely following the political fashions of the day. A number of his articles with rather telling titles appeared in the course of the Russo-Turkish War.<sup>84</sup> However, in 1884 he published a monumental work on *The Byzantine State and Church in the nth Century*<sup>85</sup> – a veritable encyclopedia of the history and institutions of Byzantium in 1018–81, which has not lost its significance to this day thanks to its extensive source base.<sup>86</sup>

81 Födör I. Uspenskii, "Okhridskaya rukopis' Ioanna Kuropalata Skilitzy," *Izvēstiya Russkago arkheologicheskago instituta v Konstantinopole* 4 (1899), no. 2, 1–8; Lyudmila P. Lapteva, "Slavisticheskiye issledovaniya v Russkom arkheologicheskoinstitute v Konstantinopole," in *Slavyanovedeniye v dorevolutsionnoy Rossii. Izucheniye yuzhnykh i zapadnykh slavyan*, eds. Dmitrii F. Markov and Vladimir A. Dyakov (Moscow: Nauka, 1988), 347.

82 Lyudmila Doncheva-Petkova, "Srednovekovni glineni sudove s vutreshni ushi," *Arkheologiya* (1974), no. 4, 32. Today these clay kettles are considered Pecheneg by some scholars, see Chapter 2.

83 The patrons of the RAIK were Russia's ambassador in the Ottoman Empire, Alexandr Nelidov, and state comptroller, Tertii Filippov. Thanks to Nelidov, Sultan Abdul Hamid II granted the RAIK the right to conduct excavations anywhere in the empire. Nelidov was in favor of an immediate seizure of Constantinople, which is why he was transferred to the Russian embassy in Rome in 1897. Filippov had similar views. See: Ekaterina Yu. Basargina, "Russkiy arkheologicheskii institut v Konstantinopole i Vostochnyy vopros," in *Istoriya drevney tserkvi v nauchnykh traditsiyakh XX veka* (Saint Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo Gosudarstvennogo Ermitazha, 2000), 39–41. See also: Födör Schmit, "Politika i vizantinovedeniye," *Soobshcheniya Gosudarstvennoy Akademii istorii material'noy kul'tury* (1932), no. 7–8, 6–23.

84 Such as "The Religious Nature of the Ottoman Turks' Struggle with the Greek-Slavic World before the Capture of Constantinople in 1453," or "The Turkish Government's Policy Towards Its Christian Subjects and Their Religion" – both articles were published in 1878.

85 Nikolai A. Skabalanovich, *Vizantiyskoye gosudarstvo i tserkov' v XI vėkė* (Saint Petersburg: Tipografiya F. Yeleonskogo i K<sup>o</sup>, 1884).

86 See: *GIBI*, vol. 6, eds. Ivan Duichev et al. (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Būlgarskata akademiya na naukite, 1965), 364.

In 1863, Archimandrite Antonin (Kapustin) published an important source on the history of Crimea – the so-called *Synaxarion of Sugdea*, or *Notitiae Sogdaeae*, a Greek ecclesiastical document preserved in a Christian monastery in Sougdaia (Sudak).<sup>87</sup> For many years, the monks made notes in the margins about significant events in the town's history, and it is these records that are important to historians. One of the notes speaks of a local tradition of celebrating the day when an "Uzbek" siege was lifted. In Archimandrite Antonin's view, the reference to the Byzantine emperor Con[stan]tine Monomachos (1042–54), found in these marginal notes, helps to date the manuscript and allows us to indentify the "Uzbeks" as Uzes.<sup>88</sup>

Three years later, in 1866, Daniel Chwolson published the so-called "note 59," possibly left by a medieval scribe. It states that Joseph, a Bible transcriber and teacher of Judaism from Sougdaia, finished a copy of the Bible in the year 997, "under the rule of the Pechenegs, who subjugated [this place] of our brothers Kadarians."<sup>89</sup> Chwolson also translated into Russian the observations of Ahmad Ibn Rustah Isfahani on the medieval peoples of Eastern Europe, including the Pechenegs.<sup>90</sup> During the last third of the 19th century, Avraam/Albert Harkavy, Ernst-Eduard/Arist Kunick, Viktor von Rosen, and Vasilii Bartold prepared translations of other Oriental sources for nomadic history.<sup>91</sup>

87 The manuscript was discovered by the headmaster of the Greek lyceum in Istanbul I. Patrokl on the island of Halki, in the library of the Academy of the Holy Trinity.

88 Antonin (Kapustin), "Zametki XII–XV vekov, otnosyashchiesya k Krymskomu gorodu Sugdeye (Sudaku), pripisannye na grecheskom Sinaksare," *ZOOID* 5 (1863), 601. However, the Greek scholar Maria Nystazopoulou-Pelekidou reconstructs this note differently and dates it to the 14th century, not the 11th: Maria G. Nystazopoulou-Pelekidou, "I en Tavrikí chersoníso pólis Sougdaía apó tou XIII' méchri tou XV' aiónos," *Ypourgeío Politismou. Ypiresía Archaíotíton kai Anastilóseos* 7 (1965), 119–37.

89 Daniel A. Chwolson, *Vosemnaatsat' yevreyskikh nadgrobnnykh nadpisey iz Kryma, sluzhashchikh materialom dlya ob'yasneniya nekotorykh voprosov, kasayushchikhsya bibleyskoy khronologii, semiticheskoy paleografii, drevney etnografii i istorii Yuzhnoy Rossii* (Saint Petersburg, 1866), 66–7.

90 *Izvēstiya o Khozarakh", Burtasakh", Bolgarakh", Mad'yarakh", Slavyanakh" i Russakh" Abu-Ali Akhmeda Ben' Omar' Ibn"-Dasta, neizvēstnogo doselē arabskago pisatelya nachala X veka, po rukopisi Britanskago muzeya*, ed. transl. and comment. Daniel A. Chwolson (Saint Petersburg, 1869).

91 *Skazaniya musul'manskikh" pisatelye o slavyanakh" i russkikh". S" poloviny VII veka do kontsa X veka po R.Kh.* ed., transl. and comment. Avraam Ya. Harkavy (Saint Petersburg: Tipografiya Imperatorskoy Akademii nauk, 1870); Avram Ya. Harkavy, *Dopolneniya k" sochineniyu "Skazaniya musul'manskikh" pisatelye o slavyanakh" i russkikh"* (Saint Petersburg: Tipografiya A.O. Tsederbauma, 1871); Arist A. Kunick and Viktor R. Rosen, "Izvestiya al-Bekri i drugikh avtorov o Rusi i slavyanakh," *Zapiski Imperatorskoy Akademii nauk* 32 (1878), no. 2, 1–191; Vasilii V. Bartold, "⟨Izvlēcheniye iz sochineniya Gardizi Zayn al-Akhbar⟩ Prilozheniye k 'Otchetu o poyezdke v Srednyuyu Aziyu s nauchnoyu tsel'yu.

The period from the 1870s to the early 20th century also saw the start of the archaeological exploration of medieval nomadic burials across the Eurasian steppes – from the Danube and Dniester to the Urals. Before then, scholars as a rule had to rely on random finds.<sup>92</sup> During the 1870s–1890s, Dmitrii Samokvasov and Nikolaï Brandenburg excavated approximately a hundred kurgans in the area between the Dnieper, Ros', and Irpin', containing relatively rich burials with horses. Drawing on the existing scholarship (Peter Frederik Suhm,<sup>93</sup> Vasilievskii, Kunick, et al.), as well as written sources such as the *Primary Chronicle*, *DAI*, and *Epistola Brunonis ad Henricum regem*, Brandenburg interpreted these burials as Pecheneg.<sup>94</sup> Alexandr Spitsyn (1858–1931) questioned his conclusions and suggested that the kurgans along the Ros' River were left by the Torks.<sup>95</sup> Spitsyn introduced into nomadic archaeology the principle that every medieval nomadic people had a specific funeral rite of its own.<sup>96</sup>

---

1893–1894 gg.," *Zapiski Imperatorskoy Akademii nauk po istoriko-filologicheskomu otdeleniyu* [Series 8] 1 (1897) no. 4, 78–126.

- 92 Such as, for instance, those described by Edward Witkowsky in the bulletin of the 3rd Russian Archaeological Congress: Edward Witkowsky, "Raskopki kurganov" i arkheologicheskaya nakhodka v Vasil'kovskom" uezdě," in *Trudy Tret'yago Arkheologicheskogo s'ezda v" Rossii, 1874 z.*, vol. 2, *Prilozheniya* (Kyiv: Imperatorskiy universitet Sv. Vladimira, 1878), 23–30. Or those discovered by a proprietor of sugar refineries in Central Ukraine Count Aleksei Bobrinskii: Alexei A. Bobrinskii, *Kurgany i sluchaynyya arkheologicheskaya nakhodka bliz mestechka Smely. Dnevniky pyatilētnikh" raskopok" gr. Aleksya Bobrinskago*, 3 vols (Saint Petersburg: Tipografiya Glavnogo upravleniya Udelov, 1887, 1894, 1901).
- 93 Peter F. Suhm, "Istoricheskoye razsuzhdenie o Patsinakakh" ili Pechenegakh"," *Chteniya v" Imperatorskom" Obshchestve Istorii i Drevnostey Rossiyskikh" pri Moskovskom" Universitete* 2 (1846), no. 1, 1–48.
- 94 Nikolaï Ye. Brandenburg, "Kakomu plemeni mogut" byt' pripisany tē iz" yazycheskikh" mogil" Kievskoy gubernii, v" kotorykh" vmēstē s" pokoynikami pogrebeny ostovy ubitykh" loshadey," in *Trudy Desyatogo Arkheologicheskogo s'ezda v" Rigē, 1896*, ed. Countess Uvarova (Moscow: Tipografiya G. Lissnera i A. Geshelya, 1899), 1–13. See also: *Zhurnal" raskopok N.Ye. Brandenburga 1888–1902* (Saint Petersburg: Tovarišchestvo R. Golike i A. Vil'borg, 1908). Pletnyova made a detailed analysis of the finds of nomadic remains along the Ros' River in Svetlana A. Pletnyova, *Drevnosti chernykh klubukov* (Moscow: Nauka, 1973).
- 95 Alexandr A. Spitsyn, "Kurgany kiyevskikh torkov i berendeyev," *Zapiski Imperatorskago Russkago arkheologicheskogo obshchestva* 11 (1899), no. 1–2, 156.
- 96 Idem, "Tatarskiye kurgany," *Izvestiya Tavricheskogo Obshchestva Istorii, Arkheologii i Etnografii* 1 (58) (1927), 149–53. Spitsyn was also the first to hypothesize a Cuman origin for the anthropomorphic stone statues. He conjectured that the Cumans erected these statues in those places where they made inlet burials in earlier kurgans: Alexandr A. Spitsyn, "Moi nauchnyya raboty," *SK* 2 (1928), 339.

Based on Spitsyn's arguments, Vasilii Gorodtsov attributed to the Torks and Cumans another 30 kurgans discovered along the Siverskyi Donets.<sup>97</sup> Dmytro Yavornyts'kyi excavated nomadic kurgans in Ekaterinoslav Province,<sup>98</sup> Fëdor Knauer – in the valleys of the rivers Sărata and Cogâlnic in Bessarabia.<sup>99</sup> Near Simferopol and in the lower reaches of the rivers Alma and Qaçı, Nikolai Veselovskii and Yulian Kulakovskii explored burials of 10th- to 14th-century Crimean nomads.<sup>100</sup> Yoel Stempkovskii began amateur excavations in the Prut-Dniester region as early as 1896–1910.<sup>101</sup> In the 1880s, Filipp Nefëdov, another amateur archaeologist, investigated nomadic burials in the Southern Urals.<sup>102</sup>

Most of these explorations were carried out by amateurs in a primitive fashion. Many scientific descriptions of the finds, and indeed often the finds themselves, have been lost. The ethnic identification of excavated artifacts relied primarily on written sources, and researchers tended to attribute “rich” burials to the people that dominated that particular region according to the

- 
- 97 Vasilii A. Gorodtsov, “Rezultaty arkheologicheskikh” issledovaniy v Izyumskom” uëzdë Khar'kovskoy gubernii 1901 goda,” in *Trudy Dvenadtsatogo Arkheologicheskago s"ëzda v" Khar'kovë, 1902 g.*, vol. 1, ed. Countess Uvarova (Moscow: Tovarishestvo tipografii A.I. Mamontova, 1905), 213–5.
- 98 Dmytro I. Evarnitskii [Yavornyts'kyi], “Raskopka kurganov” v” predëlakh” Yekaterinoslavskoy gubernii,” in *Trudy Trinadtsatogo Arkheologicheskago s"ëzda v" Yekaterinoslavë, 1905 g.*, vol. 1, (Moscow, 1907), 108–17. The materials of his excavations are described in “Dnevnik raskopok” D.I. Evarnitskago,” in *Trudy Trinadtsatogo Arkheologicheskago s"ëzda v" Yekaterinoslavë, 1905 g.*, 118–57.
- 99 *O raskopke neskol'kikh kurganov v Yuzhnoy Bessarabii: Referat, chit. prof. F.I. Knauerom v zasedanii Ist. o-va Nestora Letopistsa 20 noyab. 1888 g.* (Kyiv, 1889). On Professor Knauer's “well” method of kurgan excavation, which not only ruined sites, but also yielded no scientifically valid results, see: Mykola M. Shmaglii and Ivan T. Chernyakov, “Issledovaniya kurganov v stepnoy chasti mezhdurech'ya Dunaya i Dnestra (1964–1966 gg.),” in *Kurgany stepnoy chasti mezhdurech'ya Dunaya i Dnestra (Materialy po arkheologii Severnogo Prichernomor'ya)*, issue 6, *Trudy Dnepro-Dunayskoy novostroyechnoy ekspeditsii 1963–1967 gg.*, part. 1, ed. Petro O. Karyshkovskii (Odessa: Mayak, 1970), 5–7.
- 100 Aloizii O. Kashpar, “Raskopki kurganov v okrestnostyakh Simferopolya proizvedennyye prof. N.I. Veselovskim v 1895 godu,” *Izvestiya Tavricheskoy uchenoy arkhnivnoy komissii* 24 (1896), 138–50; “Proizvodstvo arkheologicheskikh raskopok” v Tavricheskoy gubernii,” in *Otchet Imperatorskoy Arkheologicheskoy Komissii za 1892 god*” (Saint Petersburg, 1894), 6–7; Yelena N. Cherepanova and Askold A. Shchepinskiï, “Pogrebeniya pozdnykh kochevnikov v stepnom Krymu,” in *Arkheologicheskiye issledovaniya srednevekovogo Kryma*, ed. Oleg I. Dombrovskii (Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1968), 181–99.
- 101 Andrii O. Dobrolyubskii, *Kochevniki Severo-Zapadnogo Prichernomor'ya v epokhu srednevekov'ya* (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986), 10–3.
- 102 See: Gennadii N. Garustovich and Vladimir A. Ivanov, *Materialy po arkheologii srednevekovykh kochevnikov Yuzhnogo Urala (IX–XV vv. n.e.)* (Ufa: Bashkirskiy gosudarstvennyy pedagogicheskii universitet im. M. Akmully, 2014), 20, 47, 54–7, 61, 65.

medieval authors. Exotic objects were usually classified as nomadic – as was the case, for instance, with the “ugly copper figurines” (depicting women with unnaturally elongated arms), which Spitsyn connected with the Pechenegs or Cumans.<sup>103</sup>

However, these early Russian discoveries and efforts to interpret nomadic burials laid the foundation for all subsequent studies of medieval nomadic remains in Eastern, Central, and Southeastern Europe.<sup>104</sup>

## 2.2 *European Oriental Studies and the History and Languages of the Medieval Nomads of the Western Eurasian Steppes. Hungarian and Turkish Historiography*

The Czech-Austrian geographer and Orientalist Vilém Tomášek (1841–1901) in his essay “More on the Study of the Balkan Peninsula”<sup>105</sup> was perhaps the first scholar to give Arabic sources a central, rather than supporting, role in research on Balkan history. He did important work on problems of ethnic attribution and on the identification of geographical names found in written sources.

A significant contribution to the study of the history of the Khazars, Bulgars, Pechenegs, Magyars, and Cumans in Eastern Europe and Central Asia on the basis of Oriental sources was made by Josef Markwart (Marquart until 1922).<sup>106</sup> From his pen came the works *Eastern European and East Asian*

103 Alexandr A. Spitsyn, “Urodlivyye mednyye statuetki,” *Izvestiya Imperatorskoy Arkheologicheskoy Komissii* 29 (1909), 147.

104 See also: German A. Fyodorov-Davydov, *Kochevniki Vostochnoy Yevropy pod vlast'yu zolotoordynskikh khanov. Arkheologicheskiye pamyatniki* (Moscow: Izdaniye Moskovskogo universiteta, 1966), 5; Svetlana A. Pletnyova, “Saltovo-mayatskaya kul'tura,” in *Stepi Yevrazii v epokhu srednevekov'ya*, 62–3; Mikhail V. Tsybin, “V. A. Gorodtsov i problemy istoriko-arkheologicheskogo izucheniya Yugo-Vostochnogo porubezh'ya Drevney Rusi,” *Istoricheskiye zapiski. Nauchnyye trudy istoricheskogo fakul'teta* (1999), no. 4, 204–15; Irina A. Sorokina, “Raskopki kurganov na yuge Rossii i stanovleniye polevoy metodiki (seredina XIX nachalo XX vv.),” *Nauchnyye vedomosti Belgorodskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya: Istoriya. Politologiya* 14 (2010), no. 7, 130–6.

105 Wilhelm Tomaschek, “Zur Kunde der Hämus-Halbinsel: topographische, archäologische und ethnologische Miscellen,” *Sitzungsberichte der Philologisch-Historische Klasse der Wiener Akademie der Wissenschaften* 99 (1882), 437–507; Idem, “Zur Kunde der Hämus-Halbinsel (II): Die Handelswege im 12. Jahrhundert nach den Erkundigungen des Arabers Idrisi,” *Sitzungsberichte der Philologisch-Historische Klasse der Wiener Akademie der Wissenschaften* 113 (1887), 285–373.

106 About him: Hans Heinrich Schaeder, “Josef Markwart,” *Ungarische Jahrbücher* 10 (1930), 113–9.



*Raiding* and “On the Cuman People.”<sup>107</sup> The first of these was more critical than historical: Markwart compared the evidence of Arabic, Persian, Jewish, Armenian, Latin, and Byzantine texts.<sup>108</sup> Among his contributions to the study of Pecheneg-Byzantine relations were the analysis of the source testimony relating to the 934 raid on Byzantium by the Magyars in alliance with the Pechenegs<sup>109</sup> and the conjecture that the Pechenegs converted to Islam.<sup>110</sup> “On the Cuman People”<sup>111</sup> was so exhaustive – considering as it did their language, name, ethnic origin, area of habitation, and the major milestones in their history – that Vasilii Bartold and Paul Pelliot had little to add in their reviews.<sup>112</sup>

In 1880, Count Géza Kuun published in Budapest a copy of the *Codex Cumanicus*.<sup>113</sup> This was not the first edition of the source,<sup>114</sup> but it attests to Hungarian scholarship’s considerable interest in the history and language of the medieval nomads of the North Pontic steppes.

- 
- 107 Josef Marquart, *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge. Ethnologische und historisch-topographische Studien zur Geschichte des 9. und 10. Jahrhunderts. (ca. 840–940)* (Leipzig: Dieterich’sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1903); Idem, “Über das Volkstum der Komanen: ein weiterer Beitrag zur Geschichte der Völkerwanderungen im ostasiatisch-osteuropäischen Steppengürtel,” *Abhandlungen der Königlich-Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-Historische Klasse. Neue Folge* (1912–1914), 25–236.
- 108 Markwart notes that al-Mas‘udi borrowed the Pecheneg tribe names Ārtim (Ἄρτιμ), Ćur (Ἐζούρ), Jyla (Ἰύλα), Kulpej (Κουλπέη), Charowoj (Χαραβόη), Talmač (Ταλματάτ), Chopon (Χοπόν), and Čopon (Ἐζοπόν) from Constantine Porphyrogenitus: Marquart, *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge*, 65–71.
- 109 *Ibid.*, 60–74. See also: István Zimonyi, *Muslim Sources on the Magyars in the Second Half of the 9th Century. The Magyar Chapter of the Jayhānī Tradition* (ECEE, 35) (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2015), 105 and 234.
- 110 *Ibid.*, 72–3. Interestingly, Markwart did not shy away from nationalist statements. In the introduction, announcing his plans for a study of the possible propaganda of Islam among the Pechenegs and Magyars in the 10th century, he observed that it was the German sword that put the Magyars on the path of Christianity: “erst das deutsche Schwert hat hier dem Kreuz den Weg bereitet” (*Ibid.*, xv). See also: Mykola Melnyk, “Vizantiya i relihiyni viruvannya pechenihiv,” *Problemy humanitarnykh nauk: Naukovi zapysky Drobobyt’skoho derzhavnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu im. Ivana Franka* (2002) no. 9, 213–22.
- 111 Stoyanov allotted an entire chapter of his monograph to Markwart (“Markwart’s Contribution to the Study of the Cuman Problem”). See: Stoyanov, *Kumanologiya: Istoriografski eskizi*, 1, 167–216.
- 112 Paul Pelliot, “À propos des Comans,” *Journal Asiatique* 15, 1920, 125–85; Vasilii V. Bartold, “Novyy trud o polovtsakh,” *Russkiy istoricheskiy zhurnal* 7 (1921), 138–56.
- 113 *Codex Cumanicus Bibliothecae at Templum Divi Marci Venetiarum*, ed. Géza Kuun (Budapest: Tippographii societatis “Franklin,” 1880).
- 114 The first editor and scholarly commentator of the *Codex Cumanicus* was Martin Heinrich Klaproth in 1828. See Salaville Sévérien, “Un manuscrit chrétien en dialecte turc: le ‘Codex Cumanicus,’” *Échos d’Orient* 14 (1911), no. 90, 278.

The history of the Magyar people was closely connected with that of the Turkic nomads of the lands north of the Black Sea. The Magyars first came face to face with the Pechenegs when they still inhabited the Volga region. Later, having suffered defeat in a war against the Pechenegs, the Magyar tribes moved to Pannonia, where they, as Hungarian historians customarily put it, accomplished “the conquest of the homeland” (*honfoglalás*). The Pechenegs and Uzes beginning in the 10th and Cumans beginning in the 11th century repeatedly raided the territory of Hungary, took part in the struggle for the Hungarian throne, and campaigned alongside the Magyars in neighboring lands. The first attempts on the part of the Hungarian rulers to settle groups of North Pontic nomads in their realm as *foederati* date from the end of the 10th century. The mass relocation of the Cumans of Khan Köten to Hungary in the first half of the 13th century led to a long period of their hegemony in the social and political life of the kingdom. Traces of the presence of medieval Turkic nomads are visible in many ethnic subgroups among the modern Hungarians. The Hungarian language borrowed extensively from various Turkic languages. All these factors help explain Hungarian historiography’s interest in the history of the nomads of the Black Sea steppes; they also defined its research priorities. Extremely important was the fact that 19th-century Hungarian scholars, unlike their Russian colleagues, did not perceive Turkic-speaking nomads as antagonists of their own people.<sup>115</sup>

Studies on medieval nomads in Hungary centered on their dealings with the Hungarians and the Hungarian state (as we know, contacts between the Magyars and other nomadic peoples go back to the times long before “the conquest of the homeland”), but they also showed interest in the languages and cultures of Turkic peoples more generally.<sup>116</sup> It was not an accident that one of the very first Hungarian works focusing specifically on the Pechenegs was authored by János Jerney, an encyclopedic scholar who spent part of his life searching for the original Hungarian homeland and attempted to locate Λεβεδία

---

115 The same does not quite hold true for the late 20th century. The Hungarian medievalist Ferenc Makk writes: “Es ist auch nicht zweifelhaft, dass die Kämpfe der ungarischen Könige auch die europäische Zivilisation und das Christentum gegen die östlichen Nomaden verteidigten.” See Ferenc Makk, *Ungarische Aussenpolitik (896-1196)* (Herne: Tibor Schäfer Verlag, 1999), 84.

116 Since Hungarian has a substantial cluster of borrowings from Turkic languages, these borrowings (including from the languages of the Pechenegs and Cumans) have become for Hungarian historians an importance source for the study of the ethnogenesis and early history of the Hungarian people. See István Zimonyi, “The State of Research on the Prehistory of the Hungarians. Historiography (Oriental Sources, History of the Steppe),” in *Research on the Prehistory of the Hungarians*, 93.

and Ἀτελοῦζου, two areas inhabited, according to the *DAI*, by Hungarians and Pechenegs.<sup>117</sup>

Among the earliest works on medieval Turkic nomads, studies by Péter Horváth and György Fejér stand out.<sup>118</sup> Prominent Hungarian scholars Ladislaus von Szalay, Pál Hunfalvy, and Gyula Pauler all tackled the question of the role of the Pechenegs, Torks, and Cumans in Hungarian history.<sup>119</sup>

With their efforts directed at elucidating the origins and early pre-Conquest history of the Hungarian people, Hungarian Oriental studies played an especially important role in advancing the understanding of Byzantine-nomadic relations. In 1870–85, István Gyárfás published a four-volume *History of Jász-Kuns*.<sup>120</sup> The first volume (1870) was devoted entirely to the history of the Cumans, as was the second chapter of the second volume, “A Besenyő-Kúnok” (Pechenegs-Kuns),<sup>121</sup> touching, though superficially, on the history of contacts between Byzantium and the Pechenegs.

One of the founders of Oriental studies in Hungary, Mihály Kmoskó (1876–1931),<sup>122</sup> endeavored not only to bring Eastern Europe and the Slavs, Finno-Ugric peoples, and the nomads of the Eurasian steppes into the orbit of European history, but also to draw attention to the Islamic and Syrian sources relevant to this field. His research in fact continued in the direction defined by J. Markwart and G. Kuun,<sup>123</sup> but with much greater thoroughness – as, for instance, in his

117 János Jerney, “A magyarországi besenyőkről,” *A magyar tudós társaság évkönyve* 5 (1842), 144–84. Even earlier came out a book by Adam Rajcsányi, *De bisseis regni Hungariae, eorumque comitibus* (Posonii [Bratislava]: Joannis Michaelis Landerer, 1757), which was not a scholarly work.

118 Péter Horváth, *Commentatio de initiis, ac maioribus Iazygum et Cumanorum eorumque constitutionibus, a Petro Horvath ex probatis scriptoribus et authenticis documentis deprompta* (Pest: Matthiae Trattner, 1801); György Fejér, *A kunok eredete* (Pest: Edelman K., 1850).

119 Ladislaus von Szalay, *Geschichte Ungarns* (Pest: Wilhelm Lauffer, 1866); Pál Hunfalvy, *Etnographie von Ungarn* (Budapest: Franklin-Verein, 1877); Gyula Pauler, *A Magyar nemzet története az Árpád-házi királyok alatt*, 2 vols (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1899); Idem, *A Magyar nemzet története: Szent Iszvánig* (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1900). For the publication of source evidence, see *A magyar honfoglalás kútfői*, ed. Gyula Pauler and Sándor Szilágyi (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1900).

120 István Gyárfás, *A Jász-Kúnok Története* (Kecskemét/Szolnok/Budapest: Nyomatott Szilády Károlynál, 1870–1885).

121 The ethnonym *Qun* (Kun) is commonly seen as the Hungarian name for the Cumans. There is no unanimity among Turkologists regarding its etymology. See Stoyanov, *Kumanologiya. Opiti za rekonstruktsiya*, 49–53.

122 About him: *Orientalische Berichte über die Völker Osteuropas*, XIII.

123 For the 1000-year anniversary of the *honfoglalás*, Géza Kuun published a compendium of *Oriental Sources: Sources on the Hungarian Conquest of the Homeland*, incorporating a great deal of Arab and Persian testimony on the Pechenegs: Géza Kuun, *Keleti kútfők: A Magyar honfoglalás kútfői* (Kolozsvár, 1898). He wrote a special study on Gardīzi:

editorial work on the oeuvre of Gardīzī, al-Istachri, ‘Awfī, and other authors who wrote about various medieval nomads.<sup>124</sup> One of the topics that interested Hungarian Orientalists was Cuman and Pecheneg toponymics.<sup>125</sup>

From 1913–18 and 1921–29, the Sándor Kőrösi Csoma Society in Budapest published the journal *Túrán*, initially under the editorship of Count Pál Teleki. The linguists Willi Bang and Zoltán Gombocz contributed to it articles on the meaning of the ethnonym “Pechenegs.”<sup>126</sup> In 1920, the academic segment of the Society broke away to form the Kőrösi Csoma Association, a scholarly community of Hungarian Orientalists, which functions to this day. A new journal was started, *Kőrösi Csoma Archivum (KCsA, 1918–43)*. Its first editor was the Hungarian Turkologist Gyula Németh (1890–1976).<sup>127</sup>

Németh’s hometown was Karcag in the region of Cumania Major (Nagykunság in Hungarian),<sup>128</sup> still inhabited by descendants of the Cumans settled there in the 11th to 13th centuries. His most important works focused on early history of the Magyars and their contacts with Turkic peoples, especially the Pechenegs.<sup>129</sup> In 1922, *KCsA* published his article “Concerning the Evidence on the Pechenegs,” in which he analysed the Turkic names of Pecheneg tribes in the *DAI*.<sup>130</sup> In 1932, Németh offered his interpretation of the inscriptions

---

Idem, “Gurdezi a törökökről,” *Keleti Szemle* 2 (1901), 1–5, 168–81. See also: Bálint Hóman, “Őstörténetünk keleti forrásai,” *Századok* 42 (1908), 865–83.

- 124 See: Károly Czeglédy, “Monographs on Syriac and Muhammadan Sources in the Literary Remains of M. Kmoskó,” *Acta Orientalia ASH* 4 (1954), no. 1/3, 19–91. Mihály Kmoskó’s manuscripts have recently been published by István Zimonyi and Szabolcs Felföldi: Mihály Kmoskó, *Mohamedán írók a steppe népeiről. Földrajzi irodalom*, 2 vols, ed. István Zimonyi (Budapest: Balassi Kiadó, 1997–2000); vol. 3, *Szír írók a steppe népeiről*, ed. Szabolcs Felföldi (Budapest: Balassi Kiadó, 2004).
- 125 János Karácsonyi, “Néhány besenyő és kun helyneveinkről,” *Magyar nyelv* 17 (1921), no. 9–10, 211–12. See also: Anita Rácz, “Népnevek és helynevek (Tézisek egy kutatási programhoz),” *Névtani értesítő* 27 (2005), 143–52; István Kniezsa, “Magyarország népei a XI-ik században,” in *Emlékkönyv Szent István király halálának kilencszázadik évfordulóján*, vol. 2, ed. Jusztián Serédi (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1938), 365–472.
- 126 Willi Bang, “Über den Volksnamen besenyő,” *Túrán* 3 (1918), no. 6–7, 436–7; Zoltán Gombocz, “Über den Volksnamen besenyő,” *Túrán* 3 (1918), no. 4, 209–15.
- 127 About him: András Róna-Tas, *Németh Gyula* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1990); Géza Uray, “A Bibliography of the Works of Prof. Németh,” *Acta Orientalia ASH* 11 (1960), no. 1–3, 3–28.
- 128 There are also such historic regions in Hungary as Kiskunság (Cumania Minor) and Jászság (Jazigia).
- 129 A full bibliography can be found in Gyula Németh, *Törökök és magyarok*, vol. 2, *Oszmán törökök* (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Könyvtára, 1990), 287–312.
- 130 Julius Németh, “Zur Kenntnis der Petschenegen,” *KCsA* 3 (1922), 219–25. An extended version of this study appeared in 1930: Julius Németh, “Die Petschenegischen

on the finds from Nagyszentmiklós (Sânnicolau Mare).<sup>131</sup> His *magnum opus* was *The Formation of the Hungarian Conquerors in the Era of the Conquest of the Homeland*.<sup>132</sup> In this book, he considered the makeup of the Hungarian tribes in the late 9th century and the role of Turkic tribes, particularly the Pechenegs, in their ethnogenesis.

The *KCsA* also lent its pages to the early works of Géza Fehér (1890–1955), a Hungarian historian and archaeologist, founder of modern Proto-Bulgarian archaeology in Bulgaria.<sup>133</sup> In his article “The Pechenegs and Hungarian Tales about the Huns” he hypothesized that the tale of Attila’s son Abu preserved information about the migration of the Pecheneg tribe of Chaban, mentioned in the *DAI*, to Hungary.<sup>134</sup> Fehér’s works on Bulgaro-Hungarian relations in the early Middle Ages and his general overview of the history of the North Pontic nomads still have not lost their academic value.<sup>135</sup>

---

Stammesnamen,” *Ungarische Jahrbücher* 10 (1930), 27–34. In 1940, the scholar made an attempt to decipher the ethnonym *Kun*: Julius Németh, “Die Volksnamen Quman und Qün,” *KCsA* 3 (1941–1943), 95–109. On this subject, see also: Karl H. Menges, “Etymological Notes on Some Păcănăg Names,” *Byzantion* 17 (1944–1945), 256–80. No fewer than 70 toponyms based on the root *Besenyő* [Pecheneg] are found within the historic borders of Hungary. The root *Kun* also occurs quite often.

- 131 Julius Németh, “The Runiform Inscriptions from Nagy-Szent-Miklós and the Runiform Scripts of Eastern Europe,” *Acta Linguistica ASH* 21 (1971), no. 1–2, 1–52.
- 132 Idem, *A honfoglaló magyarság kialakulása* (Budapest: Hornyánszky Viktor könyvnyomdája, 1930).
- 133 See: Felix Kanits, *Kolumb na Balkanite. (Geza Fekher. Zhivot, pütuvaniya i nauchno delo)* (Sofia: Literaturen forum, 2000). The term “Proto-Bulgarians” is, of course, artificial and technical; its function is to distinguish the modern Bulgarians from their nomadic ancestors, and, in the view of Valeri Īotov, it will continue to be used as *terminus technicus*: Valeri Īotov, “Rannyaya ili prabolgarskaya kul’tura. Chto nuzhno otmenit’, chto mozhno dobavit’,” in *Bolgarskiy Forum I. Materialy Mezhdunarodnogo Bolgarskogo Forum (19–21 iyunya 2010 g., Bolgar)*, eds. Rafael S. Khakimov et al. (Kazan: 000 “Foliant”; Institut istorii im. Sh. Mardzhani AN RT, 2011), 109.
- 134 Géza Fehér, “Die Petschenegen und die ungarischen Hunnensagen,” *KCsA* 2 (1921), 125. This conjecture met with little to no support in Hungarian historiography. It was criticized by Gyula Czebe: Gyula Czebe, “Turco-byzantinische Miscellen (I),” *KCsA* 3 (1922), 209–19. An article by Györfly includes a map that places the Chaban tribe between the Don and Donets: György Györfly, “Sur la question de l’établissement des Petchénègues en Europe,” *Acta Orientalia ASH* 25 (1972), 283–92 [Pic. 1.].
- 135 Géza Fehér, *Bulgarisch-Ungarische Beziehungen in den V–XI Jahrhunderten* (Budapest: Nyomatott Taizs József könyvnyomdájában, 1921); Idem, “Zur Geschichte der Steppenvölker von Südrussland im 9–10. Jahrhundert,” *Studia Slavica ASH* 5 (1959), no. 3–4, 257–326.

During the 1920s and 1930s, *KCsA* published, among others, pieces by Eugen Darkó,<sup>136</sup> Gyula Czebe,<sup>137</sup> and Karl Brockelmann,<sup>138</sup> as well as the first works of Gyula Moravcsik<sup>139</sup> and György Györffy.<sup>140</sup> Most of these focused on the written sources for the history of ethno-political relations in Eastern and Southeastern Europe, often with special attention to the oeuvre of Constantine Porphyrogenitus. Györffy's monograph "Besenyők és magyarok" ("The Pechenegs and the Magyars," his doctoral dissertation) gave a brief overview of the historiography of Pecheneg history and the Hungarian sources relating to it, sketched out the prehistory of the Pechenegs, and dwelled in depth on their dealings with the Magyars, the subsequent assimilation of the Pechenegs by the Magyars, and their sedentarization. The study included numerous source excerpts and a list of Pecheneg settlements with their locations.<sup>141</sup> Other scholars who worked during this period on the history of Pechenegs and Uzes in Hungary included Béla Kossányi,<sup>142</sup> István Polány,<sup>143</sup> János Belitzky,<sup>144</sup> and István Kniezsa.<sup>145</sup> László Madarassy, Ödön Boncz, Gyula Miskolczi, Gyula Mészáros, and others studied the Cumans.<sup>146</sup> In 1943, a collective volume on *Prehistory of the*

- 
- 136 Eugen Darkó, "Zur Frage der urmagyarischen und urbulgarischen Beziehungen," *KCsA* 4 (1924), 292–301.
- 137 Gyula Czebe, "Turco-byzantinische Miszellen (I);" Idem, "Turco-byzantinische Miszellen (II)," *KCsA* 4 (1924), 306–10.
- 138 Karl Brockelmann, "Mahmud al-Kašgharī über die Sprachen und die Stämme der Türken im 11. Jahrhundert," *KCsA* 1 (1921), 26–40. About him: Károly Czeglédy, "Carl Brockelmann (1868–1956)," *Acta Orientalia ASH* 7 (1957), no. 1–3, 105–7.
- 139 Gyula Moravcsik, "Nikolaos Mystikos a 'nyugati turkok'-ról," *KCsA* 1 (1921), 156–7; Idem, "Ungarische Bibliographie der Turkologie und der orientalisches-ungarischen Beziehungen. 1914–1925," *KCsA* 2 (1926) no. 3, 199–236.
- 140 György Györffy, "Besenyők és magyarok," *KCsA* 5 (1940), 397–500. Review: István Kniezsa, "Györffy György: Besenyők és magyarok. Budapest, 1940. (Klny. a Kőrösi Csoma Archívumból)," *Századok* 77 (1943), no. 7–10, 472–5.
- 141 Margit Szokolay drew up a rather exhaustive list of the locations of Pecheneg settlements in Hungary: "A magyarországi besenyőtelepekről," *Föld és Ember* 9 (1929), no. 2, 65–90.
- 142 Béla Kossányi, "Az úzok és kománok történetéhez a XI–XII. században," *Századok* 57–58 (1923–1924), no. 1–6, 519–37.
- 143 István Polány, "A nyugatmagyarországi magyar elem (lövőörök, székeleyek és besenyők) kipusztulása," *Vasi szemle* 3 (1936), no. 1–2, 36–69.
- 144 János Belitzky, "A nyugat-dunántúli és felvidéki besenyő telepek," in *Emlékkönyv Domanovszky Sándor születése hatvanadik fordulójának ünnepére* (Budapest: Királyi Magyar Egyetemi Nyomda, 1937), 59–95.
- 145 István Kniezsa, "A nyugat-magyarországi besenyők kérdéséhez," in *Emlékkönyv Domanovszky Sándor születése hatvanadik fordulójának ünnepére*, 323–37.
- 146 Ödön Boncz, "A kun és magyar viselet az utolsó Árpádok és az Anjouk alatt," *AE* (1887), 193–207 (on Cuman and Magyar dress); Gyula Mészáros, *Magyarországi kun nyelvemlékek* (Budapest: Franklin-Társulat Nyomdája, 1914); László Madarassy, "Kunok Istene," *Magyar nyelv* 24 (1928), no. 3–4, 121; Gyula Miskolczi, "A kúnok ethnikumához," *Történeti szemle* 7

*Hungarians* appeared in Budapest, presenting the understanding of the early history of the Hungarian tribes and their relations with neighboring peoples then prevalent in Hungarian historical scholarship.<sup>147</sup> In 1940, Bálint Hóman (1885–1951) published a book on the history of the Hungarian Middle Ages, in which the Pechenegs were represented as allies of the Hungarians against Byzantium in the 10th century.<sup>148</sup>

In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, Hungarian archaeologists began trying to identify Pecheneg (primarily in the Sárviz region)<sup>149</sup> and Cuman burials.<sup>150</sup> Lajos Bartucz used materials from excavations in the Karcag – Ködszállás *puszta* (steppe) to compile an interesting anthropometric description of the burials in a Cuman (Kun) village (Bartucz himself thought that a large majority of the inhabitants were Pechenegs).<sup>151</sup> However, in the words of Csanád Bálint,

- 
- (1918), no. 1–2, 23–52. For an overview of the accomplishments of Hungarian historiography in the study of the history and language of the Cumans before 1945, see: Stoyanov, *Kumanologiya: Istoriografski eskizi*, 1.
- 147 *A magyarság őstörténete*, ed. Lajos Ligeti (Budapest: Franklin Társulat Nyomdája, 1943). Among the authors are: Miklós Zsirai, Lajos Ligeti, Kun Tibor Halasi, Károly Czeglédy, József Deér, István Kniezsa, Gyula László, Béla Gunda, János Nemeskéri, Mátyás Gyóni, and Béla Kossányi.
- 148 Bálint Hóman, *Geschichte des ungarischen Mittelalters*. I. *Von den ältesten Zeiten bis zum Ende des XII. Jh.* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1940), 132.
- 149 András Pálóczi-Horváth, *Peoples of Eastern Origin in Medieval Hungary. The Cultural Heritage of Pechenegs, Uzès, Cumans and the Jász*, transl. Heinrich Härke et al. (Budapest: Archaeolingua, 2014), 265.
- 150 Géza Nagy, “A régi kunok temetkezése,” *AE* 13 (1893), 105–17; Idem, “A magyarhoni lovas sírok,” *AE* 13 (1893), 223–34 (on burials with horses in Hungary); Idem, “Hadtörténelmi emlékek az Ezredéves Kiállításon,” *AE* 16 (1896), 344–65; Gyula Nagy Kislégghi, “Arankavidéki halmok,” *AE* 27 (1907), no. 3, 266–79 (on the hypothetical Pecheneg archaeological footprint in Banat); Idem, “Az óbessenyői őstelep (Torontál megye),” *AE* 29 (1909) no. 2, 146–54; Idem, “Az óbessenyői őstelep,” *AE* 31 (1911) no. 2, 147–64 (on Pecheneg settlements); Szabó Kálmán, *Az Alföldi Magyar Nép Művelődéstörténeti Emlékei* (Budapest: Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum, 1938). See also an overview of 10th- and 11th-century burials in the Carpathian Basin: Sarolta Tettamanti, “Temetkezési szokások a 10–11. században a Kárpát-medencében,” *Studia Comitatus* (1975) no. 3, 79–123. Nándor Fettich described the leaf-like part of horse harness, commonly seen as Pecheneg; Nándor Fettich, *A honfoglaló magyarság fémművessége. Die Metallkunst der landnehmenden Ungarn* (Budapest: Magyar Történelmi Múzeum, 1937), 51. For a detailed bibliography of the archaeological exploration of the Danubian region to 1945, see: *A Közép-Dunamedence régészeti bibliográfiája a legrégibb időktől a XI. századig*, eds. János Banner and Imre Jakabffy (Budapest: Akadémiai kiadó, 1954). See also András Pálóczi-Horváth, “Situation des recherches archéologiques sur les Comans en Hongrie,” *Acta Orientalia ASH* 27 (1973), no. 2, 201–9.
- 151 Lajos Bartucz, “Egy régi kuntelep embertani feltárása. (A Karcag – Ködszállási ásátások),” *Antropológiai Füzetek* (1923), no. 4–6, 81–6.

“at that time Hungarian scholars could imagine only mounted and armed graves of an Oriental nature as relics of their ancestors.”<sup>152</sup>

As a result of its defeat in World War I, Hungary lost the regions of Partium, Banat, and Transylvania. A total of 31.7 percent of Hungary’s territory and 5.2 million of its population were ceded to Romania, including cities and regions where Hungarians constituted substantial majorities.<sup>153</sup> This could not but find reflection in disputes between Hungarian and Romanian historians. The “historic right” to Banat and Transylvania was much debated (as a rule, these controversies were based on diverging interpretations of the *Gesta Hungarorum*).<sup>154</sup> Furthermore, Hungarian scholars felt compelled to be skeptical about the history of Romanian statehood itself.<sup>155</sup>

Romanian and Bulgarian historiography had already been long debating the ethnic composition of the Byzantine lands south of the Danube. Romanian historians, starting with N. Iorga, adhered to a scheme according to which the lands along the Lower Danube, which came back under Byzantine rule after the fall of the First Bulgarian Empire, were populated mainly by Romanian ethnic elements (the Βλάχοι of the Greek sources). Because of frequent nomadic attacks on these territories, Byzantine authority there remained nominal, and this presumably allowed the Romanians to create proto-statelets of their own.

Hungarian historians and Orientalists set out to challenge this model, emphasizing the dominant role of Turkic nomads in the history of the region. In 1927, László Rásonyi published “Valacho-Turcica,”<sup>156</sup> an article in which

152 Csanád Bálint, “Hungarian Contributions to the Archeology,” *Hungarian Studies* 12 (1997) no. 1–2, 24.

153 *Recensământul general al populației României 1930*, vol. 2, *Neam, limbă maternă, religie* (Bucharest: Editura Institutului central de statistică, 1938), 8–9, 58–9, 84–5, 130–1, 134–5, 290–1, 316–7, 394–5, 468–9, 476–7.

154 See: Alexandru Madgearu, *The Romanians in the Anonymous Gesta Hungarorum: Truth and Fiction* (Bibliotheca rerum Transsilvaniae, 34) (Cluj-Napoca: The Romanian Cultural Institute, 2005), 7–12.

155 Using as his case studies the American South, France after the Franco-Prussian War, and Germany after World War I, Wolfgang Schivelbusch explores the gamut of possible cultural and intellectual responses to defeat: Wolfgang Schivelbusch, *The Culture of Defeat: On National Trauma, Mourning, and Recovery* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2004). On the impact of Hungary’s military and diplomatic defeat on the study of the early history of the Hungarians, see *Östörténet és nemzetudat, 1919–1931: Az 1988. áprilisában Szegeden rendezett egynapos ülészak előadásai*, ed. Éva Kincses Nagy (Szeged: JATE Magyar Östörténeti Kutatócsoportja, Balassi Kiadó, 1991).

156 Ladislaus Rásonyi-Nagy, “Valacho-Turcica,” in *Aus den Forschungsarbeiten der Mitglieder des Ungarischen Instituts und des Collegium Hungaricum in Berlin. Dem Andenken Robert Graggers gewidmet* (Berlin/Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1927), 68–96.



he analyzed Romanian names of Turkic origin and generally dwelled on the importance of the Pechenegs, Cumans, and Tatars in the Danubian-Dniestrian-Carpathian region and on the presence of Mongoloid elements in parts of the modern Romanian population. Rásonyi subsequently returned to this topic a number of times.<sup>157</sup> His conclusions were often frankly speculative and aimed at humiliating his Romanian opponents. For instance, he argued that the Vlach and Slavic population played the passive, and the Pechenegs, Uzes, Cumans, and Tatars the active role in the “colonization” of Moldova and Wallachia. In 1935, Gábor Lükő wrote an article on “The Peoples of Wallachia and Moldova in the 10th to 12th Centuries,”<sup>158</sup> continuing in the same historiographical vein. Thus, the history of Turkic nomads in the region became hostage to the politics of Romano-Hungarian relations.

Mátyás Gyóni (1913–55)<sup>159</sup> considerably expanded the range of sources traditionally used in Hungarian historiography, mainly by introducing his colleagues to Byzantine texts – his *Hungarians and Hungary in Light of Byzantine Sources* came out in 1938.<sup>160</sup> In 1944 appeared a German version of his article “On the Question of Romanian State Formation in 11th-Century Paristrion,”<sup>161</sup> which to this day remains a stumbling block for Romanian historians. In it, Gyóni meticulously analyzed the entire body of Greek testimony on events in the Byzantine province of Paristrion, paying special attention to ethnic names. He questioned the existence of Romanian proto-statelets in the region and the presence in these lands, perpetually suffering from nomadic raids, of an

- 
- 157 Idem, “Karaiman, Caraiman herceg,” *Magyar nyelv* 26 (1930), no. 9–10, 392–3; Idem, “Baszaraba,” *Magyar nyelv* 29 (1933), no. 5–6, 160–71; Idem, “Contributions à l’histoire des premières cristallisations d’état des Roumains. L’origine des Basarabas,” *AECO* 1 (1935), 221–53. Rásonyi’s synthetic interpretation of the history of Cumans in the Danube region (based mostly on onomastic observations) was published in 1939; Idem, “Tuna Havzasında Kumanlar,” *Bellekten, Türk Tarih Kurumu* 2 (1939), no. 12, 401–22.
- 158 Gábor Lükő, “Havaselve és Moldva népei a X–XII. században,” *Ethnographia* (1935), 90–105.
- 159 About him: János Harmatta, “M. Gyóni (1913–1955),” *Acta Antiqua ASH* 3 (1955) no. 4, 335–7.
- 160 Mátyás Gyóni, *Magyarország és a Magyarság a Bizánci források tükrében: Ungarn und das Ungartum im Spiegel der Byzantinischen Quellen* (Magyar-görög tanulmányok, 7) (Budapest: Pázmány Péter Tudományegyetem, Görög Filológiai Intézet, 1938).
- 161 Idem, “Zur Frage der rumänischen Staatsbildungen im XI. Jahrhundert in Paristrion (Archaisierende Volksnamen und ethnische Wirklichkeit in der ‘Alexias’ von Anna Komnene),” *AECO* 9–10 (1943–1944), 83–188. This work first came out in Hungarian in 1942: Idem, *A paristrioni “államalakulatok” etnikai jellege. Archaizáló népnév és etnikai valóság Anna Komnene Alexiasában* (Budapest: Magyar Történettudományi Intézet, 1942).

autochthonous Romanian population.<sup>162</sup> Considering the earliest written evidence on the Vlachs, Gyóni several times addressed the problem of relations between Byzantium and the Danubian Turks. Since one of the first Byzantine references to the Vlachs was closely connected with the last Cuman raid on Byzantium in the 11th century, Gyóni made an in-depth overview of the raid, attempting to date it<sup>163</sup> and to pin down its route.<sup>164</sup> Becoming interested in the toponym *Blökumannaland*, found in the “Hákonar saga Herðibreiðs” in Snorri Sturluson’s *Heimskringla*,<sup>165</sup> Gyóni did not limit himself to the analysis of the possibility of identifying this toponym with Wallachia.<sup>166</sup> Since the saga related the story of a campaign of the Byzantine emperor Kiriakos (according to Gyóny, Κύρι[ος] Ἀλέξι[ος])<sup>167</sup> with auxiliary forces of Varangians, Franks, and the Flemish against heathen nomads, culminating in a battle in *Pezinavöllu*, the scholar interpreted these heathens as Cumans and the location of the battle – as “the place where Pechenegs once lived.” He dated the event itself to 1113/14 – that is, the so-called second campaign of Pseudo-Diogenes against Byzantium.<sup>168</sup>

- 
- 162 “Es konnte demnach im Paristrion von keinen wlachischen Staatskeim en die Rede sein, auch von keinen Autonomien, geschweige denn von Wojwodschaften, die nach byzantinischem Muster durch Nachahmung der Themen-Organisation entstanden worden wären”: Gyóni, “Zur Frage der rumänischen Staatsbildungen,” 188. Gyóni limited himself to sources dealing, in his view, specifically with the Vlachs in the Balkans (Romanian scholars counted source reports on the “Scythians” among the testimony on the Vlachs): Mátyás Gyóni, *A legrégibb vélemény a Román nép eredetéről: Kekaumenos művei mint a Román történet forrása* (Budapest: Magyar Történettudományi Intézet, 1944). In the post-war years, Gyóni conceived a plan to publish all the 10th- to 13th-century sources on the Vlachs (177 documents). Gyóni’s tragic death cut this project short: Gennadii G. Litavrin, “Vlaxhi vizantiyskikh istochnikov X–XIII vv.,” in *Yugo-Vostochnaya Yevropa v sredniye veka*, ed. Lazar’ L. Polevoi (Kishinev: Shtiintsa, 1972), 93.
- 163 Mátyás Gyóny, “La première mention historique des Vlaques des monts Balkans,” *Acta Antiqua ASH* 1 (1952), no. 3–4, 497–8. This conclusion was later accepted by Diaconu as well: Diaconu, *Les Coumans*, 58.
- 164 Gyóny, “La première mention historique des Vlaques des monts Balkans,” 497, 508–9.
- 165 *Heimskringla: eða Sögur Noregskonunga Snorra Sturlusonar*, vol. 3 (Uppsala: W. Schultz, 1872), 258–60.
- 166 Mátyás Gyóny, “Les variantes d’un type de légende byzantine dans la littérature ancienne-islannaise,” *Acta Antiqua ASH* 4 (1956), no. 1–4, 313. See also: Eugène Lozovan, “De la Mer Baltique à la Mer Noire,” in *Die Araber in der Alten Welt*, vol. 2, *Bis zur Reichstrennung*, eds. Franz Altheim and Ruth Stiehl (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1965), 530–1.
- 167 Gyóny, “Les variantes d’un type de légende byzantine dans la littérature ancienne-islannaise,” 312.
- 168 *Ibid.* Gyóny’s take on the time and place of the campaign did not find acceptance in historiography: Diaconu, *Les Coumans*, 72–7; Tatyana N. Jackson, “Islandskiye korolevskiyе sagi kak istochnik po istorii Drevney Rusi i yeye sosedy X–XIII vv.,” in *Drevneyshiyе gosudarstva na territorii SSSR. Materialy i issledovaniya, 1988–1989 gody*, ed. Anatoliï P. Novosel’tsev

Reviewing a book by Moravcsik, Gyóny suggested that a book-length general study of the Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans, transcending the confines of the national histories of Ukraine, Moldova, or the Balkan countries, was long overdue.<sup>169</sup>

Many Hungarian scholars, starting with the founder of Hungarian Turkology Ármin Vámbéry, showed a fascination for the so-called Hungarian Turanism (*Turanizmus*).<sup>170</sup> Even though the Turkish version of Turanism was largely a departure from the imperative of Islamic unity,<sup>171</sup> it provided a ground for fruitful cooperation between Hungarian and Turkish Oriental studies. Articles by Hungarian scholars were translated into Turkish, and, respectively, Hungarian periodicals lent their pages to Turkish scholarship on medieval nomads.<sup>172</sup> A number of Hungarian Turkologists did research and taught in Turkey.<sup>173</sup>

Interest on the part of Turkish historiography in the history of the pre-Ottoman Turks in Europe was a late development. In 1912, an article by the Bulgarian scholar Stoyan Dzhansüзов on “The Turks in the Balkan Peninsula” appeared in a Turkish periodical.<sup>174</sup> It discussed the Cumans and Oghuzes.<sup>175</sup>

---

(Moscow: Nauka, 1991), 119. See also: Richard M. Dawkins, “An Echo in the Norse Sagas of the Patzinak War of John Komninos,” *Mélanges E. Boisacq. Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves* 5 (1937), 243–9. Krijnie N. Ciggaar, “Flemish Mercenaries in Byzantium: Their Later History in an Old Norse Miracle,” *Byzantion* 51 (1981), 44–74; Alexandru Madgearu, *The Asanids. The Political and Military History of the Second Bulgarian Empire (1185–1280)* (ECEE, 41) (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2014), 60.

- 169 Mátyás Gyóny, “[Review of:] Moravcsik G., *Bizánc és a magyarság*. Magyar Tudományos Akadémia. Budapest, 1955,” *Acta Antiqua ASH* 4 (1956), no. 1–4, 328.
- 170 Éva Kincses Nagy, “A turáni gondola,” in *Óstörténet és nemzettudat, 1919–1931: Az 1988. áprilisában Szegeden rendezett egynapos ülészek előadásai*, 44–9. See also: Joseph A. Kessler, *Turanism and Pan-Turanism in Hungary, 1890–1945* [Ph.D. thesis] (Berkeley, 1967).
- 171 “Turanism, which appeared in the latter days of the empire, constituted a virtual denial of the Islamic tradition among the Turks, extolling, as it did, Turkic ethnicism in contrast to the theocratic interracialism of the community of the Faithful (ümme)”: George G. Arnakis, “Turanism: An Aspect of Turkish Nationalism,” *Balkan Studies* 1 (1960), no. 1, 22–23. Péter Langó thinks that Hungarian Turanism “was a sort of reaction to Pan-Slavic movements”: Péter Langó, “Archaeological Research on the Conquering Hungarians: A Review,” in *Research on the Prehistory of the Hungarians*, 229.
- 172 For instance: Béla Kossányi, “XI–XIIinci Asırlarda Uzlar ve Komanların Tarihine Dair,” *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı Belleten* 8 (1944), no. 29, 119–36.
- 173 Ignác Kúnos (Lusztig) in 1922–27, László Rásonyi in 1933–42, Tibor Halasi-Kun in 1942–48.
- 174 Üstünyân Cansızof, “Balkan Şibh-i Ceziresinde Türkler,” *Tarih-i Osmanî Encümeni Mecmuas* 3 (1912), no. 17, 1076–96.
- 175 It is generally believed that the tribes mentioned in the Byzantine sources as Uzes (Οὔζοι) and in the *Primary Chronicle* as Torks (Torki) represent a branch of the Oghuz Turks. See: Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, 1, 90–1; Peter B. Golden, “The Migrations of the Oğuz,” *Archivum Ottomanicum* 4 (1972), 83.

In 1933, the Turkologist Hüseyin Namik Orkun published *The Pechenegs*<sup>176</sup> (the first monograph on the subject),<sup>177</sup> and two years later – a book on the Oghuzes.<sup>178</sup>

Well known and frequently cited around the world is the voluminous work by the Tatar-Turkish historian Akdes Nimet Kurat *The History of the Pechenegs*.<sup>179</sup> In it, Kurat traces this people's historical path from the earliest references to them in Oriental sources to the last reports in Rus' and Hungarian chronicles, describing in detail their migrations, settlement (including in the Balkans), economic life, and religious beliefs. An important aspect of the book is Kurat's engagement with Byzantine sources, especially the *DAI* – in 1933, he defended a doctoral dissertation at Hamburg University on “Die türkische Prosopographie bei Laonikos Chalkokondyles.” The book treats at length the subject of Byzantium's relations with the Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans.<sup>180</sup> Among its contributions to “Pecheneg” historiography is a list of place names in Anatolia and Syria that could be linked to these nomads (Becenek, Bala Becenek, Zir Becenek, Peçenek, Peçene, Becenek Boğazı, and others).<sup>181</sup>

The scholarly career of the Bashkir historian Zeki Velidi Togan, known for his work with Oriental sources on the Pechenegs, was also associated with Turkey. In 1923, he discovered a manuscript of Ibn Fadlan's *Risala* in the Astane Quds Museum (Mashhad, Iran), and in 1939 – published a book on the journey of Ibn Fadlan.<sup>182</sup>

176 Hüseyin N. Orkun, *Peçenekler* (Istanbul: Remzi Kitaphanesi, 1933).

177 Tryjarski, “Pieczyngowie,” 493.

178 Hüseyin N. Orkun, *Oğuzlara dair* (Ankara: Ulus Basımevi, 1935). One of the first Turkish works on the Oghuzes was written by Fuad M. Köprülüzâde – “Oğuz etnolojisine dair tarihî notlar,” *Türkiyat Mecmuası* 1 (1925), 185–211.

179 Akdes N. Kurat, *Peçenek tarihi* (Istanbul: Devlet basımevi, 1937). Kurat also published an earlier, extended article on the Pechenegs: Idem, “Peçeneklere dair araştırmalar,” *Türkiyat Mecmuası* 5 (1936), 101–40.

180 Kurat, *Peçenek tarihi*, 106–237.

181 *Ibid.*, 238–9. These names likely derive not from the Pechenegs of the steppes north of the Black Sea, but from an Oghuz clan that migrated to Anatolia in the 10th century: Faruk Sümer, *Oğuzlar (Türkmenler): Tarihleri – Boy Teşkilâtı – Destanları* (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi, 1972), 320–3.

182 Ahmet Zeki V. Togan, *Ibn Fadlan's Reisebericht* (Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1939). Helmut Ritter published a German translation with commentary in 1942 (“Zum Text von Ibn Fadlan's Reisebericht,” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 96 (1942), no. 1, 98–126). Before 1945, the Russian Orientalist Vladimir Minorskiĭ, who emigrated to the West after the Revolution of 1917, issued translations of two Oriental sources relating to the history of the Oghuzes and Pechenegs with commentary – *Ḥudūd al-Ālam. “The Regions of the World”: A Persian Geography: AH 372–AD 982*, transl. and expl. Vladimir Minorsky, preface Vasilii V. Bartold, transl. from the Russian and with add. material by the late professor Minorsky, ed. Clifford E. Bosworth. 2nd ed. (London:

Bizarre visions of a common past and illusory hopes for a common future can be an incentive and not just an obstacle – the achievements of Hungarian and Turkish historiography in the study of medieval nomadic peoples are a case in point.

### 2.3 “*The Battle for History*”: Romanian Historiography, Bulgarian Historiography, and the Lower Danube in the 10th to 12th Centuries

The principal task of fledgling Romanian historiography was to find an identity of its own. Its main efforts were focused on the problems of the origins of the Romanians and the history of their settlement in Eastern European lands, including those that were (and still are, though in latent form) subject to long-standing territorial disputes. Many a sword was crossed by Romanian historians with other Eastern European scholars in trying to prove that the Romanian population was autochthonous to the territories they inhabited in the modern era. Establishing the Roman principle of *jus primi occupantis* was the chief purpose of nearly every historical study.

The subject of one such heated controversy between Romanian and Bulgarian historians was Dobruja. At the beginning of the 20th century, Bulgaria claimed the entirety of the lands between the Lower Danube and the Balkans, but as a result of the Second Balkan War and World War I it lost Southern Dobruja (the so-called Cadrlater). The tactical approach of Bulgarian historiography was based on the fact that Dobruja, just as the territories Bulgaria was disputing with Greece and Yugoslavia, was part of the First and to some extent Second Bulgarian Empire. As for the 11th and 12th centuries, when the Bulgarian lands fell under Byzantine rule, Bulgarian historians endeavored to show that Constantinople’s power there was nominal. The predominantly Bulgarian character of the population of Byzantium’s Danubian provinces (especially Dobruja) was also emphasized.

Romanian historians, in their turn, highlighted the presence on the right bank of the Lower Danube of a large Romanian (Vlach) population, which as early as the 11th century already had its own proto-state structures, took active part in the formation of the Second Bulgarian Empire, and more. These matters were the focus of a long-standing academic quarrel.<sup>183</sup>

---

Luzac, 1970); *Sharaf al-Zaman Tahir Marvazi on China, the Turks and India*, ed. Vladimir Minorsky (London: Royal Asiatic Society, 1942). On Minorskiĭ, see Yaroslav V. Pylypchuk, “Kumanologicheskiye issledovaniya V.F. Minorskogo,” in *Chteniya pamyati V.F. Minorskogo (1877-1966). Istchnikovedeniye i istoriografiya stran Blizhnego i Srednego Vostoka* (Saint Petersburg: Lema, 2013), 132–5.

183 Interestingly, Pecheneg and Cuman presence in the vicinity of the river Vardar, reported in the sources, gave Serbian historiography an excuse for historical speculations as well

The illustrious Romanian scholar Nicolae Iorga (1871–1940) originated many of the ideas that shaped Romanian historiography.<sup>184</sup> Having begun his academic career with the publication of sources on Romanian history<sup>185</sup> and research on the Crusades, Iorga eventually engaged with problems of Romanian history directly. Overall, he authored 1259 monographic studies and approximately 25,000 articles.<sup>186</sup> Among his achievements, he proposed a new version of the hypothesis of the autochthonous origin of the Romanian people, in support of which he marshaled a broad assortment of historical, ethnographic, archaeological, and linguistic evidence.<sup>187</sup> He certainly could not bypass the subject of the history of nomads in the Danubian-Carpathian region and the Balkans. In 1919, he delivered a paper at a meeting of the Romanian Academy of Sciences on the beginnings of state formation among the Romanians. Based on Byzantine reports about a coup in the province of Paristrion, Iorga asserted that the leaders of the anti-Byzantine rebellion Τατούς (Χαλῆς), Σατζᾶς, and Σεσθάβος were Romanians, and that the autonomous “state formation” they created was Romanian (it was in fact only two cities, Silistra and Vicina).<sup>188</sup>

---

(Jovan Hadži-Vasiljević, Vladimir Petković): Muzaffer Tufan, “Les Turcs de la Macédoine et Leurs Arts,” *Erdem* 5 (1989), 877–8. On the controversies surrounding Byzantium in the national historiographies of Greece, Bulgaria, Serbia, and Romania, see: Diana Mishkova, “The Afterlife of a Commonwealth: Narratives of Byzantium in the National Historiographies of Greece, Bulgaria, Serbia and Romania,” in *Entangled Histories of the Balkans*, 118–273.

- 184 On N. Iorga as a Byzantinologist, see: *Nicolae Iorga, istoric al Bizanțului*, ed. Eugen Stănescu (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1971).
- 185 *Izvoarele istoriei României*, vol. 3, *Scritori bizantini (sec. XI–XIV)*, eds. Alexandru Elian and Nicolae-Șerban Tanașoca (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1975), xx.
- 186 For the scholar’s bibliography as of 1931, see: *Închinare lui Nicolae Iorga. Cu prilejul împlinirii vârstei de 60 de ani* (Cluj: Editura Institutului de istorie universală, 1931), 1–xxxviii. For a bibliography of works relating to the history of Dobruja, see: Gelu Culicea, *Dobrogea în lucrările lui Nicolae Iorga: bibliografie adnotată și comentată* (Constanța: Biblioteca Județeană Constanța, 1998).
- 187 Lazar’ L. Polevoi, “Formirovaniye osnovnykh gipotez proiskhozhdeniya vostochnoromanskikh narodnostey Karpato-Dunayskikh zemel’ (feodal’naya i burzhuaznaya istoriografiya XVII – perv. pol. XX v.),” in *Yugo-Vostochnaya Yevropa v sredniye veka*, 81.
- 188 Nicolae Iorga, “Cele dintâi cristalizări de stat ale românilor (Comunicație făcută la Academia Română),” *RI* 5 (1919), no. 1–2, 103–13. A French version of the paper was published in 1920: Idem, “Les premières cristallisations d’État des Roumains,” *Bulletin de la Section Historique de l’Académie Roumaine* (1920), no. 5–8, 33–46. Here Iorga continued, to an extent, the tradition of the so-called “Latinist historiographical school”: Samuil Micu, Petru Major, and Gheorghe Șincai had proposed to see as “crypto-Romanians” the populations hiding in the medieval sources under the names of Bulgars, Pechenegs, Cumans, or Scythians (See Mishkova, “The Afterlife of a Commonwealth: Narratives of Byzantium in the National Historiographies of Greece, Bulgaria, Serbia and Romania,” 141).

This idea was further developed and substantiated by Nicolae Bănescu.<sup>189</sup> Nicolae Drăganu and Constantin Necşulescu did not agree that Τατούς should be identified as a Romanian (and neither did Nicolae Densuşianu, George Giuglea, and Vasile Bogrea),<sup>190</sup> but did not contest Iorga's theory in general.<sup>191</sup> Aurealian Sacerdoţeanu also did not believe in the "Romanianness" of Τατούς and stressed the fact that in 1072 the rebels counted on support from the Serbs and Bulgarians, too.<sup>192</sup> In 1927, Bulgarian historian Petăr Mutafchiev published a study on *The Bulgarians and Romanians in the History of the Danubian Lands*, in which he extensively criticized Iorga's scheme.<sup>193</sup> Mátyás Gyóni subsequently did so as well (see above). Thus, what happened was a classic instance of "Ševčenko's law of the dog."<sup>194</sup>

In 1927, Nicolae Iorga, under impression from Bruce Boswell's essay "The Kipchak Turks," delivered another paper at a meeting of the history section of the Academy of Sciences on "Romanian-Barbaric Cooperation" in the Middle Ages.<sup>195</sup> Rather than following the example of most Russian and Bulgarian scholars and discussing conflict and friction between sedentary peoples and

189 Nicolae Bănescu, "Cele mai vechi ştiri bizantine asupra românilor de la Dunărea de Jos," *Anuarul Institutului de istorie naţională din Cluj 1* (1921–1922), 138–61; Idem, "Paristrion, un ducat de graniţa bizantin în Dobrogea de astăzi," *Analele Dobrogei 2* (1921) no. 3, 313–7; Idem, *Bizanţul şi romanitatea de la Dunărea de Jos. Discurs rostit la 25 maiu 1938 în şedinţă solemnă* (Bucharest: Monitorului oficial şi Imprimeriei statului, Imprimerie naţională, 1938).

190 See: Gyóni, "Zur Frage der rumänischen Staatsbildungen," 115.

191 Nicolae Drăganu, *România în veacurile IX–XIV pe baza toponimiei şi a onomasticeii* (Bucharest: Monitorul oficial şi Imprimeriile statului, 1933), 574; Constantin Necşulescu, "Ipoteza formaţiunilor politice române la Dunăre în sec. XI," *RIR 7* (1937), 122–51.

192 Aurealian Sacerdoţeanu, "Mouvements politiques et sociaux de la Péninsule Balkanique dans la seconde moitié du XIe siècle," *Balkanica 2–3* (1939–1940), 89–91.

193 Petăr Mutafchiev, *Bŭlgari i rumŭni vŭ istoriyata na dunavskitye zemi* (Sofia: Pečatnica "Hudoţnik," 1927), 207–22. In French: Idem, *Bulgares et Roumains dans l'histoire des pays danubiens* (Sofia: G. Danov, 1932), 231–59.

194 "... [T]he scent of an argument on one issue draws scholars into more arguments on the same issue": Simon Franklin and Johnatan Shepard, *The Emergence of Rus 750–1200* (London/New York: Longman, 1996), XXI.

195 Nicolae Iorga, "Imperiul Cumanilor şi domnia lui Băsărabă. Un capitol din colaboraţia româno-barbară în Evul Mediu," *Analele Academiei Române: Memoriile Secţiunii Istorice 3* (1928), no. 8, 97–103. It appears that the following statement struck a particular chord with the Romanian scholar: "[The Cumans'] most important influence on Hungarian history was that they prevented the Magyars from colonising the Wallachian plain, which was thus kept open for the subsequent rise of the Roumanian principalities": Alexander Bruce Boswell, "The Kipchak Turks," *The Slavonic Review 6* (1927), no. 16, 85; Iorga, "Imperiul Cumanilor şi domnia lui Băsărabă. Un capitol din colaboraţia româno-barbară în Evul Mediu," 100.

nomads, Iorga stressed the essential role of the collaborative aspects of their relationship in the emergence of the Romanian state.<sup>196</sup>

In the inter-war period, scholarly interest in the history of the Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans in the future Romanian lands was not limited to these nomads' place in Romanian state-building. Ioan Ferent, a Catholic priest from the ethnic minority of Csángó, published in the pages of the little-known periodical *Cultura creștină* (Blaj) a study of the Cuman Bishopric. Among other things, he considered the history of the region's nomads, their relations with Hungary, Rus', and Byzantium, and their role in the formation of the Second Bulgarian Empire.<sup>197</sup> Constantin Brătescu wrote on the Pechenegs and the historical geography of Dobruja, where that ethnic group, in Brătescu's view, left a distinct footprint.<sup>198</sup> Works by Nicolae Grămadă and Gheorge Ioan Brătianu raised the question of localizing events pertaining to the history of Byzantium's relations with the Pechenegs and Uzes.<sup>199</sup> Toponymics and onomastics traditionally enjoyed much attention.<sup>200</sup> The origins of some of the ethnic minorities in Romania, such as the Gagauzes and Hutsuls, were traced back to medieval nomadic peoples.<sup>201</sup> During the late 19th and first half

- 
- 196 On Iorga's views regarding Romanian state-building and the role of nomads in it, see: Ștefan Ștefănescu, "Începuturile statelor românești în viziunea lui Nicolae Iorga," *SRDI* (1971), no. 4, 673–81.
- 197 The study came out in book form in 1931: Ioan Ferent, *Cumani și Episcopia lor* (Blaj: Tipografia Seminarului Teologic gr.-catolic, 1931), 1–56.
- 198 Constantin Brătescu, "Pecenegii. Pagini de istorie medievală (sec. XI) traduse din Georgios Kedrenos," *Analele Dobrogei* 5–6 (1925), 145–57; Idem, "Dobrogea în sec. XII: Bergean, Pastrion," *Analele Dobrogei* 1 (1920), 3–38.
- 199 Nicolae Grămadă, "Vicina: Izvoare cartografice. Originea numelui. Identificarea orașului," *Codrul Cosminului. Buletinul Institutului de Istorie și Limbă* 1, (1924), 437–59; Idem, "Ozolimna," in *Codrul Cosminului. Buletinul Institutului de Istorie și Limbă* 2–3 (1925–1926), 85–97; Gheorge Ioan Brătianu, *Recherches sur Vicina et Cetatea Albă; contributions à l'histoire de la domination byzantine et tatară et du commerce génois sur le littoral roumain de la mer Noire* (Bucharest: Paul Geuthner, 1935); Idem, "Vicina II. Nouvelles recherches sur l'histoire et la toponymie médiévale du littoral roumain de la Mer Noire. A propos des 'Miscellanies' de M.J. Bromberg," *Revue Historique du Sud-Est Européen* 19 (1942), no. 1, 133–75.
- 200 Ilie Gheorghel, "Cercetări privitoare la nomenclatura comanilor," [part 1–2] *Revista Tinerimea Română* (1899), 263–4; (1900), 387–8; [part 3–4] *Revista Arhiva* (1905), 357–9; (1910), 124–6; [part 5–7] *Revista pentru Istorie, Arheologie și Filologie* 16 (1915–1922), 187–94; Drăganu, *Românii în veacurile IX–XIV pe baza toponimiei și a onomasticeii*; Constantin I. Karadja, "Karadja, nume peceneg în toponimia Românească," *RI* 29 (1943), 87–92; Titus Hotnog, *Câteva nume topice românești de origine cumană* (Iași, 1933).
- 201 Gheorghe Popescu-Ciocănel, *Găgăuzii* (Bucharest, 1912); Ștefan Georgescu, "Găgăuzii și originea lor," *Viața Românească* 29 (1913), no. 6, 366–77; Ion Nistor, *Problema ucrainiană în lumina istoriei* (Chernivtsi: Glasul Bucovinei, 1934), 65–8.



of the 20th century, archaeological excavations began in Romania in places potentially associated with the history of the trans-Danubian nomads.<sup>202</sup>

In 1939, Constantin Necşulescu published a thorough study of “The Uz Invasion of Byzantium through the Romanian Lands.”<sup>203</sup> Necşulescu had previously touched on the subject of Byzantium’s Danubian possessions in an article criticizing Iorga’s identification of the Scythians of the Byzantine sources with the Romanians.<sup>204</sup> In the piece on the Uzes, he considered the questions of their origin, economic activities, migration into Europe, relations with the Rus’ principalities, and their appearance on the Danube. Rather than just sketching out a general picture of the history of one particular nomadic people (as did, for instance, Ioan Ferent), Necşulescu endeavored to offer as comprehensive a survey as possible of the sources, especially Byzantine, for the history of the Uzes and clarify as much as possible the details of their presence in the Balkans, including the geography of their movements, chronology of events, and the like. This article, along with the works of Nicolae Bănescu, marked a qualitatively new level for Romanian historiography.

A student of Karl Krumbacher, Nicolae Bănescu (1878–1971)<sup>205</sup> was one of the most remarkable Romanian Byzantinologists of the 20th century. His research was primarily focused on the Balkan provinces of Byzantium, particularly the Lower Danube. In his works, Bănescu denied Bulgarian historiography’s right to “usurp” the history of Byzantium’s Balkan provinces in the 10th to 12th centuries, elaborating on Iorga’s arguments about the Romanian population’s long presence in these lands and about the development of local Romanian political structures from the late 10th century onwards.<sup>206</sup> In the

202 Grigore Florescu, “Fouilles et recherches archéologiques à Calachioi (Capidava?) en 1924 et 1926,” *Dacia* 3–4 (1927–1932), 483–515; Idem, “Capidava în epoca migrațiilor,” *RIR* 16 (1946), 325–43; Gheorghe Ştefan, “Dinogetia, I. Risultati della prima campagna di scavi,” *Dacia* 7–8 (1937–1940), 401–25.

203 Constantin Necşulescu, “Năvălirea uzilor prin Țările Române în Imperiul Bizantin,” *RIR* 9 (1939), 185–204.

204 Necşulescu, “Ipoteza formațiunilor politice române la Dunăre în sec. XI.”

205 For an overview of his life and work, see: Stefan Brezeanu, “Bizantinistul Nicolae Bănescu (100 de ani de la naștere),” *RdI* 31 (1978), no. 12, 2221–33.

206 Nicolae Bănescu, “Cele dintâi cristalizări de stat ale românilor,” *RI* 5 (1919), no. 1–2, 103–13; Idem, “Cele mai vechi știri bizantine asupra românilor la Dunărea de Jos,” *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie Națională* 1 (1921–1922), 138–60; Idem, “Les premiers témoignages sur les Roumains du Bas-Danube,” *BNJ* 3 (1922), 287–310; Idem, *La Romanité de la Dobroudja à travers les siècles. Travail préparé à l’occasion du 5<sup>e</sup> Congrès international de thalassothérapie de Bucarest-Constantza (mai 1928)* (Bucharest: Cultura, 1928); Idem, *Bizanțul și romanitatea de la Dunărea de Jos*; Idem, “Les divigations d’un helléniste de la ‘nouvelle école’ [Review of: Necşulescu C., ‘Ipoteza formațiunilor politice române la Dunăre în sec. XI,’ *Revista Istorică Română*, VII, 1937],” *Revue historique du Sud-Est Européen* 15 (1938), 69–71.

articles “A Byzantine *Strategos* of the 11th Century: Katakalon Kekaumenos,” “The Byzantine Dominion over the Regions of the Lower Danube,” “A New Κατεπάνω Βουλγαρίας,” and a number of others, Bănescu laid out his views on the history and administration of Byzantium’s Balkan provinces from the fall of the First Bulgarian Empire and until the restoration of Bulgarian statehood. Based on the already known sources and new, especially sigillographic, discoveries, he formulated an approach to the history of the region entirely different from the one then prevalent in international Byzantine studies under the influence of the works of Vasil Zlatarski.<sup>207</sup>

Bănescu’s work was of great importance for the study of the history of the Lower Danube in the Middle Ages, including Byzantine-Pecheneg and Byzantine-Cuman relations. An early article of his dealt directly with forms of Byzantine rule on the Lower Danube and considered nomadic raiding activity in the region.<sup>208</sup> In 1939, Bănescu delivered a paper at the 7th Congress of Byzantine Studies in Algiers on the Byzantine period in the history of the Pechenegs and Cumans.<sup>209</sup>

Bănescu made something of a name for himself in the European academic circles of the first half of the 20th century as an uncompromising polemicist. It would not be much of an overstatement to say that not a single article on the history of the Danubian lands in the 11th century escaped his critical notice.<sup>210</sup> His debate with V. Zlatarski concerning the administrative structure

- 
- 207 Idem, “Changements politiques dans les Balkans après la conquête de l’Empire de Samuel (1018). Nouveaux duchés byzantins: Bulgarie et Paristrion,” *Bulletin de la section historique de l’Académie Roumaine* 10 (1923), 49–72; Idem, “Un duc byzantin du XIe siècle: Katakalon Kékauménos,” *Bulletin de la section historique de l’Académie Roumaine* 11 (1924), 25–36; Idem, “Ein neuer κατεπάνω Βουλγαρίας,” *BZ* 25 (1925), 331–2; Idem, “La domination byzantine sur les régions du Bas-Danube,” *Bulletin de la section historique de l’Académie Roumaine* 13 (1927), 10–22; Idem, “Sceau byzantin inédit, trouvé à Silistrie,” *Bulletin de la section historique de l’Académie Roumaine* 13 (1927), 23–4; Idem, “Chilia (Licostomo) und das Bithynische Χηλή,” *BZ* 28 (1928), 68–72; Idem, “Unbekannte Statthalter der Themen Paristrion und Bulgarien: Roman Diogenes und Nikephoros Botaniates,” *BZ* 30 (1930), 439–44; Idem, “Ein Schlusswort über das Bithynische Χηλή,” *BZ* 32 (1932), 334–5; Idem, “Les sceaux byzantins trouvés à Silistrie,” *Byzantion* 7 (1932), 321–3; Idem, “La question du Paristrion (ou conclusion d’un long débat),” *Byzantion* 8 (1933), 277–308; Idem, *Un problème d’histoire médiévale. Création et caractère du second empire bulgare* (Bucharest: Cartea Românească, 1943); Idem, *L’ancien État bulgare et les pays roumains* (Bucharest: Bucovina, 1947).
- 208 Idem, “La domination byzantine sur les régions du Bas-Danube,” *Bulletin de la section historique de l’Académie Roumaine* 13 (1927), 10–22.
- 209 Gabriel Millet, “Les études byzantines au Congrès d’Alger,” *Comptes rendus des séances de l’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 84 (1940) no. 2, 141–2.
- 210 See, for instance, Nicolae Bănescu, “Fantaisies et réalités historiques, réponse à l’article de M.J. Bromberg,” *Byzantion* 13 (1938), 73–90; Idem, “[Review of:]

of Byzantium's Danubian provinces is particularly worth mentioning. In his article "Political Changes in the Balkans after the Conquest of the Empire of Samuel (1018)," Bănescu proposed the following picture: initially, in the year 972, Emperor Ioannes I Tzimiskes created Paristrion, a new *theme* with the capital in the city of Dorostolon, comprising the former eastern regions of Bulgaria. Afterwards, in 1018 or perhaps even two or three years earlier, Basil II formed another new *theme* out of new territorial acquisitions – Bulgaria, which included the western parts of Simeon's former domain.<sup>211</sup>

In 1946, Bănescu published in post-war Bucharest a book on *The Byzantine Rulers of Paristrion (Paradunavon) and Bulgaria*,<sup>212</sup> giving his views their final shape. He also compiled a list of the rulers of the *themes* of Paristrion and Bulgaria – the fruit of many years of research, the results of which he continued to publish after the appearance of the above book.<sup>213</sup> While modern scholarship has not found evidence to confirm that some of the individuals on Bănescu's list were indeed governors of the Byzantine *themes* of Bulgaria

---

Bartikyan R.M., 'Kriticheskiye zametki o zaveshchanii Yeustafii Voila (1059 g.)' dans *Vizantiyskiy Vremennik*, 1961, т. 19, с. 26–37," *RÉSEE* 1 (1963), 211–3. In the 1930s, Bănescu initiated yet another academic discussion – on the particulars of the Pecheneg-Byzantine war of the mid-11th century. Such Byzantinologists as Georgina Buckler, Franz Dölger, Paul Lemerle, Paul Orgels, Johannes Karayannopoulos, and Hans-Georg Beck weighed in. Bănescu presented his point of view in the article "Dampolis or Diakene: An Episode of the Byzantine-Pecheneg War": Nicolae Bănescu, "Dampolis ou Diakéné: une épisode de la guerre byzantino-pechénègue," *Bulletin de la section historique de l'Académie Roumaine* 26 (1945), no. 2, 185–91. Litavrin describes the discussion in detail in the commentary to his 1972 edition of the work of Keukamenos: Gennadii G. Litavrin, "Kommentarii [k]:" *Sovety i rasskazy Kekavmena. Sochineniye vizantiyskogo polkovodtsa XI v.*, ed., transl. and comment. Gennadii G. Litavrin (Moscow: Nauka, Glavnaya Redaktsiya Vostochnoy Literatury, 1972), 395–400.

211 Nicolae Bănescu, "Changements politiques dans les Balkans après la conquête de l'Empire de Samuel (1018). Nouveaux duchés byzantins: Bulgarie et Paristrion," *Bulletin de la section historique de l'Académie Roumaine* 10 (1923), 49–72; Vasil Zlatarski, "Ustroystvo Bolgarii i polozheniye bolgarskogo naroda v pervoye vremya posle pokoreniya ikh Vasiliyem II Bolgaroboytseyu," in *Izbrani proizvedeniya*, 2, 126; Bănescu, "La question du Paristrion (ou conclusion d'un long débat)." It is worth noting that, despite all the intense scholarly polemic exchanges between them, Bănescu and Zlatarski also kept up a private correspondence on friendly terms. See: Todor Ganev, *Bŭlgaro-rumŭnski nauchni i kulturni vrŭzki. 1869–1944. Dokumenti* (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bŭlgarskata akademiya na naukite, 1973), 96–7.

212 Nicolae Bănescu, *Les Duchés byzantins de Paristrion (Paradounavon) et de Bulgarie* (Bucharest: Institut Roumain d'Études Byzantines, 1946).

213 Idem, "A propos de Basile Apokapes, duc de Paradounavis (= Paristrion). La notice du moine Théodule (1059)," *RÉSEE* 1 (1963), 155–8.

or Paristrion,<sup>214</sup> the line of inquiry initiated by the Romanian medievalist has generally been acknowledged (including in Bulgarian historiography) as “closer to the truth” than the path taken by Zlatarski.<sup>215</sup>

The first steps in the study of the Bulgarian Middle Ages were made by the Czech historian Konstantin Jireček (1854–1918).<sup>216</sup> In his research, Jireček paid particular attention to the ethno-historical aspects of the Balkan past and highlighted the influence of Byzantium on the Slavic peoples. He was one of the founders of Bulgarian archaeology.<sup>217</sup> Of special interest from the point of view of Byzantine-nomadic relations are the following essays by Jireček: “The Military Road from Belgrade to Constantinople and the Balkan Passes,”<sup>218</sup> “Christian Elements in the Topographic Nomenclature of the Balkan Lands”<sup>219</sup> (first published in 1887), and “Some Reflections on the Remnants of the Pechenegs and Cumans and on the So-Called Gagauz and Surguch Nationalities.”<sup>220</sup> The first two dealt with questions of the historical geography and toponymics of the Balkans. Using a wide variety of both written and ethnographic sources, including Roman ones, the Czech scholar successfully located important events of Bulgarian medieval history, including those relating to the Pecheneg-Byzantine wars.<sup>221</sup> The third essay took up the problem of surviving traces of Turkic nomadic presence on the Danube and

214 Alexandru Madgearu, “The Military organization of Paradunavon,” *BS* 60 (1999), no. 21, 423.

215 Tůpkova-Zaimova, *Dolni Dunav – granichna zona*, 10.

216 About him: Dimitŕ Angelov, “Konstantin Ireček i negovoto delo,” *IstPreg* (1955), no. 1, 100–12.

217 Stamen Mikhailov, “K. Ireček i bŭlgarskata arkeologiya,” *Arkeologiya* (1968) no. 2, 8–12. Bulgarian scholar Nikolai Todorov called Jireček “the only representative of Balkan studies” in the late 19th century: Nikolai Todorov, “Balkanistikata v Bŭlgariya,” *Studia Balcanica* 2 (1970), 8.

218 Konstantin Jireček, *Die Heerstrasse von Belgrad nach Constantinopel und die Balkanpässe. Eine historisch-geographische Studie* (Prague: F. Tempsky, 1877); [Reprint in] *Recherches et Études sur l'histoire du peuple bulgare*, vol. 1, *L'histoire bulgare dans les ouvrages des savants europeens* (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bŭlgarskata akademiya na naukite, 1969), 117–134; Angelov, “Konstantin Ireček i negovoto delo,” 104.

219 Konstantin Jireček, “Khristiyanskiyat element v topografskata nomenklatura na Balkanskite zemi,” *Periodichno spisanie na Bŭlgarskoto knizhovno druzhestvo* 55–56 (1898), 223–68.

220 Idem, “Einige Bemerkungen über die Überreste der Petschenegen und Kumanen, sowie über die Völkerschaften der sogenannten Gagauzi und Surguči im heutigen Bulgarien,” *Sitzungsberichte der Königl. böhmische Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften. Classe für Philosophie, Geschichte und Philologie* (1889), 3–30.

221 See: Diaconu, *Les Petchénegues au Bas-Danube*, 66–9.

in the Balkans. Jireček saw the Gagauzes as descendants of medieval nomads, namely the Cumans.<sup>222</sup>

Bulgarian historical scholarship generally maintained close ties with Russian and Ukrainian medieval studies. Such historians as Spiridon Palauzov and Marin Drinov were deeply involved in the academic life of the Russian Empire.<sup>223</sup> Vasil Zlatarski (1866–1935)<sup>224</sup> was a student of V. Vasilievskii.<sup>225</sup> Parts of the considerable scholarly oeuvre of Zlatarski still have not lost their significance.<sup>226</sup> His *magnum opus* was *The History of Bulgaria in the Middle Ages*. Part two of the first volume and the second and third volumes contained overviews of the history of the Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans and their relations with the Bulgarians, Hungarians, Rus', and Byzantium from the end of the 9th to the beginning of the 13th century. Compared to "Byzantium and the Pechenegs," the book covered a broader chronological range. The nomads were not treated as a separate subject – Zlatarski saw their raids, settlement, and participation in local revolts as part of Bulgarian history. His source base was more extensive, including, among others, *Тълкувание Данилово* (Daniel's Exegesis)<sup>227</sup> and *Life of Saint Gavril Lesnovski*. Zlatarski surveyed the historiography of the problem accumulated over the 62 years that had passed since

222 Vasil Marinov, "[Review of:] R. Bichayev, P. Danilov i M. Umarov, 'O gagauzakh Sredney Azii,' *Izvestiya AN UzSSR*, seriya obshch. nauk, 6, 1960 g., str. 60–65," *IstPreg* (1961), no. 2, 98.

223 See: Petür Todorov, "Ruskata istoriopsis i formirano na bulgarskata istoricheska nauka," in *Sbornik lektsii za slediplomna kvalifikatsiya na uchiteli* (Veliko Tarnovo: Velikotürnovski universitet "Sv. sv. Kiril i Metodii," 1980), 27–60; Radoslav Mishev, "Problemüt za bulgaro-ruskite nauchni vrüzki po istoriya i pomoshnitate istoricheski distsiplini v kraja na XIX i nachaloto na XX v. v bulgarskata i süvetskata istoriografiya," in *Slavistichni prouchvaniya. Sbornik v chest IX Mezhdunaroden slavistichen kongres* (Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 1983), 159–73; Alexandür Burmov, "Marin Drinov kato istorik na Bulgariya," in *Izledvaniya v chest Marin S. Drinov*, eds. Alexandür Burmov et al. (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bulgarskata akademiya na naukite, 1960), 105–18.

224 About him: Vasil Vasilev, "Nauchna sesiya za prof. Vasil N. Zlatarski vüv Veliko Türnovno," *IstPreg* (1977) no. 3, 152–6; James Clarke, "Zlatarski and Bulgarian historiography," *Slavonic Review* 15 (1937), 435–9.

225 Dimitür Angelov, "Byzantinistik in Bulgarien," in *Antike und Mittelalter in Bulgarien*, eds. Veselin Beshevliev and Johannes Irmscher (Berliner Byzantinische Arbeiten, 21) (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1960), 109–28.

226 Petür Petrov, "Predgovor," in *Izbrani proizvedeniya*, 1, 7.

227 For a modern edition of this source with commentary, see Vasilka Tüpkova-Zaimova, Anisava Miltenova, *Istoriko-apokaliptichna knizhnina v srednovekovna Vizantiya i Bulgariya* (Sofia: Universitetsko izdatelstvo "Sv. Kliment Ohridski," 1996), 125. Pechenegs are also discussed in the apocryphal *Skazanie na prorok Isaïya kak be vüznesen ot angel do sedmoto nebe* (Ibid., 202); Ivan Biliarsky, *The Tale of the Prophet Isaiah. The Destiny and Meanings of an Apocryphal Text* (ΕΕΕΕ, 23) (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2013), 21.

“Byzantium and the Pechenegs.”<sup>228</sup> He attempted to clarify both the chronology of Byzantium’s relations with the trans-Danubian Turks<sup>229</sup> and the locations of most of the events pertaining to those relations,<sup>230</sup> which Vasilievskii had mostly avoided doing because his aims were different. *The History of Bulgaria* also reconsidered the ethnic identity of some of the tribes and groups mentioned in Byzantine sources.<sup>231</sup> While “Byzantium and the Pechenegs” described the history of the Pechenegs against the backdrop of Byzantine history, Zlatarski considered the trans-Danubian nomads through the prism of their dealings with the population of the conquered Bulgarian lands, not just Constantinople.

Vasilievskii wanted to show the diplomatic significance of the Turks of the North Pontic steppes for Byzantium; Zlatarski, for his part, paid more attention to local politics and tried to assess the nomads’ positive or negative role in Bulgarian history. Aside from the Pechenegs, he also dwelled in some depth on the Uzes and especially the Cumans. Overall, since the appearance of “Byzantium and the Pechenegs,” this was the first work that dealt with the history of the trans-Danubian Turks on such a broad geographical and chronological scale.

Zlatarski also authored several articles on the history of Byzantium in the 11th century, in which he considered some aspects of nomadic history as well. Thus, in “Ibrahim Ibn Yaqub’s Notice about the Bulgarians in 965”<sup>232</sup> he analyzed that Arab source’s testimony on the Bulgarians and Pechenegs of the 10th century. Another article, “Administrative Order in Bulgaria and the Condition of the Bulgarian People in the Immediate Aftermath of Their Subjugation by Basil II the Bulgar Slayer,”<sup>233</sup> as well as materials published in the course of Zlatarski’s long debate with N. Bănescu,<sup>234</sup> made important points about the administration of Byzantium’s Bulgarian possessions. These works also established

228 Zlatarski, *Istoriya na bŭlgarskata dŭrzhava prez Srednite vekove*, 2, 92–119.

229 George Ostrogorsky in his *History of the Byzantine State* speaks highly of Zlatarski’s efforts in this direction.

230 Zlatarski, *Istoriya na bŭlgarskata dŭrzhava prez Srednite vekove*, 2, 92, 94, 96, 113, 115, 188, 210, 213, 218, 519 etc.

231 *Ibid.*, 187–189, 500–503 etc.

232 Vasil Zlatarski, “Izvestieto na Ibrakhim-ibn-Yakuba za bŭlgarite ot 965 godina,” in *Izbrani proizvedeniya*, 2, 70–88 [first published in 1921].

233 Idem, “Ustroystvo Bolgarii i polozheniye Bolgarskogo naroda v pervoye vremya posle pokoreniya ikh Vasiliyem II Bolgaroboytseyu,” *SK* 4 (1931), 49–69.

234 [The year of the original publication is given in square brackets] Idem, “Molivdovulŭt na vesta Simeon, katepan na Podunaviето,” in *Izbrani proizvedeniya*, 2, 141–6 [1929]; Idem, “Molivdovul na Samuil Alusian,” in *Izbrani proizvedeniya*, 2, 172–84 [1922]; Idem, “Molivdovulŭt na Alusian,” in *Izbrani proizvedeniya*, 2, 147–58 [1931]; Idem, “Edna datirana pripiska na grŭtski ot sredata na XI vek,” in *Izbrani proizvedeniya*, 2, 159–71 [1929]; Idem, “Namestnitsi-upraviteli na Bŭlgariya prez tsaruvaneto na Aleksii I Komnin,” in *Izbrani proizvedeniya*, 2, 185–229 [1932].

some of the names of officials and military commanders who fought against the trans-Danubian Turks. In his article “Which People Did Anna Komnene Mean by *γένος τι Σκυθικόν*?”<sup>235</sup> Zlatarski analyzed in detail the episode of the settlement of “a Scythian tribe” found in the *Alexiad* and concluded that by the “Scythian *genus*” Anna meant none other than the Uzes.<sup>236</sup>

Petür Mutafchiev (1883–1943)<sup>237</sup> focused his research mainly on the agrarian history of Byzantium,<sup>238</sup> Bulgaro-Romanian relations in the 11th to 13th centuries,<sup>239</sup> and history of the Byzantine Lower Danube more generally. In his monographs<sup>240</sup> and articles,<sup>241</sup> he considered such issues as the localization of events relating to the history of the trans-Danubian Turks (especially locations of their settlements), the presence and relative proportions of the Bulgarian, Vlach, Rus’, and Turkic populations on the Lower Danube, their traces in the toponymy and ethnographic makeup of the region, proto-states in Dobruja and the area of Silistra in the 11th century, the ethnicity of their rulers, the role of the Vlachs and Cumans in the restoration of the Bulgarian state in the 12th century, and others.<sup>242</sup>

In much of his work on the history of Dobruja and Silistra, Mutafchiev pressed forward the central idea that the Vlach population was not dominant in the region and did not play a critical part either in the creation of the autonomous statelets of the 11th century or in the establishment of the Second Bulgarian Empire. The Bulgarian scholar assigned somewhat more importance in the history of the region, both in the 11th and 12th centuries, to the

235 Idem, “Kakŭv narod se razbira u Ana Komnina pod izraza *γένος τι Σκυθικόν*,” in *Izbrani proizvedeniya*, 2, 230–9.

236 Ibid., 231.

237 About him, see: Vasil Gyuzelev, “Petür Mutafchiev (1883-1943) – viden predstavitel na bŭlgarskata burzhoazna medievistika,” *IstPreg* (1983), no. 2, 83–105; *Profesor Petür Mutafchiev, poznat i nepoznat*, ed. Todor Popnedelev (Sofia: IF-94, 1997). Bibliography: Veselin Vŭlchev, *Petür Mutafchiev. Bibliografiya* (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bŭlgarskata akademiya na naukite, 1992).

238 Angelov, *Byzantinistik in Bulgarien*, 110–11.

239 Petür Mutafchiev, “Bŭlgari i rumŭni v istoriyata na dunavskite zemi,” *GSUIF* 23 (1927), 1–247; This and several other articles (“Bŭlgari i rumŭni,” 1928; “Kŭm vŭprosa za bŭlgaro-rumŭnskite otnosheniya v srednite vekove,” 1932) were reprinted in the collection *Dobruja in the Past: Petür Mutafchiev, Dobrudzha v mŭnaloto: Bŭlgari i rumŭni v istoriyata na dunavskite zemi* (Sofia: Stefanka Bankova, 1999).

240 Idem, *Istoriya na bŭlgarski narod*, vol. 1, *Pŭrvo bŭlgarsko tsarstvo*; vol. 2, *Vtoro bŭlgarsko tsarstvo* (Sofia: Bŭlgarska kniga, 1943); Idem, *Lektsii po istoriya na Vizantiya*, 2 vols (Sofia: Fond za podpomagane na studentite, 1947).

241 Idem, “Sŭdbinite na srednovekovniya Drŭstŭr,” in *Silistra i Dobrudzha: nauchno-kulturni izsledvaniya*, eds. M. Markov et al. (Sofia: Pechatnitsa “Pravo,” 1927), 101–96.

242 On Mutafchiev’s disputes with Romanian historians, see Roumen Daskalov, “Feud over the Middle Ages: Bulgarian-Romanian Historiographical Debates,” in *Entangled Histories of the Balkans*, 274–354.

trans-Danubian Turks. His interest in Turkic nomads was only strengthened by the fact that he stressed the decisive role of the Turkic, rather than Slavic, element in the formation of the Bulgarian nation.<sup>243</sup>

Bulgarian linguist Stefan Mladenov (1880–1963)<sup>244</sup> also made forays into the subject of the role of Turkic nomads in the history of his country. His work “The Pechenegs and Uzes-Cumans in Bulgarian History” had limited scholarly value, since it was based mostly on the author’s philological observations. For example, he connected the ethnonym “Bä-čän-äk” with China (Çin), and the name of the Romanian city of Măcin – with the original name of the Pechenegs. Several pages were devoted to Pecheneg raids “on Bulgaria”<sup>245</sup> and to the region’s place names possibly left from the Pechenegs and Cumans.<sup>246</sup> Mladenov also considered the idea that the Gagauzes could be descended from those medieval Turks whose history was connected with the Balkans. Together with Lyubomir Miletich and Ben’o Tsonev, Mladenov is seen as one of the pioneers of the study of the language and culture of the Gagauzes.<sup>247</sup>

Various facets of the relations between Byzantium and the nomads of the North Pontic littoral in the 11th century, as well as elements of Balkan toponymics and sigillography important for the study of those relations, were considered in the works of Karel Škorpil,<sup>248</sup> Nikola Mushmov,<sup>249</sup> Ivan Dučhev,<sup>250</sup> Kristo Miyatev,<sup>251</sup> Todor Gerasimov, Vasil Mikov, Ivan Ormandzhiev, and other scholars.

- 
- 243 Petūr Petrov, “Burzhoozno-idealisticheskiye i reaktsionno-fashisticheskiye vūzgleđi na prof. Petūr Mutafchiev,” *IstPreg* (1951), no. 4–5, 393–425; Tsvetana Kristanova, “Kūm vūprosa za etnogenezisa na bŭlgarskiya narod,” *IstPreg* (1966), no. 3, 42.
- 244 Stefan Mladenov, “Pechenyezi i uzi-kumani v bŭlgarskata istoriya,” *Bŭlgarska istoricheska biblioteka* 4 (1931), 113–36.
- 245 *Ibid.*, 115–21.
- 246 *Ibid.*, 121–5, 130–1.
- 247 Marinov, “[Review of:] R. Bichayev, P. Danilov i M. Umarov, ‘O gagauzakh Sredney Azii,’” 98.
- 248 Karel Škorpil, “Pogranichen bŭlgarski okop mezhdū r. Dunav i Chernomore,” in *Sbornik v chest na Vasil N. Zlatarski* (Sofia: Dŭrzhavna pechatnitsa, 1925), 543–53.
- 249 Nikola Mushmov, “Vizantiiski olovni pečati otŭ sbirkata na Narodniya Muzei,” *Izvestiya na bŭlgarski arkheologicheski institut* 8 (1934), 331–49.
- 250 Ivan Dučhev, “Prouchvaniya vŭrkhū bŭlgarskoto srednovekovie,” *Sbornik na Bŭlgarskata Akademiya na naukite* 41 (1945), no. 1, 1–176; chapters VI, VII and VIII: “The Mutiny of Leo Tornikios, the Bulgars, and the Pechenegs,” “The Pecheneg Chief Tyrach’s Invasion of Bulgaria in 1048–49,” and “The Pechenegs in Almoḡia.”
- 251 Kristo Miyatev, “[Review of:] Protasov N.D., ‘Slavyanskaya odezhda v bolgarskoy miniatyure XIV v. Institut arkheologii i iskusstvovznaniya.’ *Trudy sektsii arkheologii*, IV, Moskva, 1928, s. 391–407. tabl. XXIII i XXIV,” *Izvestiya na Bŭlgarskiya arkheologicheski institut* 6, (1930–1931), 326–32.



Engaging in intense polemical battles on various aspects of the history of the Lower Danube in the 10th to 12th centuries, Romanian and Bulgarian medievalists made great advances in the study of Byzantine history in that period in general and of the empire's relations with the nomads of the North Pontic steppes in particular.

#### 2.4 *Russian and Ukrainian Historiography in the 1920s–1940s*

World War I, the Revolution of 1917, the Ukrainian War of Independence, and the Civil War left Russian and Ukrainian medieval studies badly scarred. At the same time, the profound social transformations of this era gave a powerful creative impulse to the *intelligentsia* in its academic, public, and even literary pursuits.

Despite the regime change and the ensuing tectonic shift in the scientific paradigm in post-revolutionary Russia, F. Uspenskiĭ remained in the country and continued his work. In 1918, a commission on Constantine Porphyrogenitus was created, with Uspenskiĭ serving as its chair. In 1934, he published an article on “Byzantine Writers’ Reports on the North Pontic Region,” with excerpts from the *DAI*, *De Thematibus*, and *De Ceremoniis*.<sup>252</sup>

The third volume of Uspenskiĭ’s *History of Byzantium* came out posthumously in 1949. It restated the same conception of the genesis of the First Crusade that had already been formulated in *The History of the Crusades*.<sup>253</sup> Two years earlier, he completed an essay on “The Movement of Peoples from Central Asia to Europe,” considering the phases and consequences, including for Byzantium, of the great medieval migrations.<sup>254</sup> This study continued Vasilievskii’s research into the relationship between the nomads of the North Pontic steppes and Byzantium.

One of Vasilievskii’s most talented students was Alexandr Vasiliev (1867–1953).<sup>255</sup> He emigrated in 1928 and subsequently chaired the Seminarium Kondakovianum in Prague.<sup>256</sup> In the last years of his life, he was the head of the International Association of Byzantine Studies.<sup>257</sup> Apart from his

252 Yelena E. Lipshits, “Vizantiyskiye pis'mennyye istochniki,” in *Sovetskoye istochnikovedeniye Kiyevskoy Rusi. Istoriograficheskiye ocherki*, ed. Valentin V. Mavrodin (Leningrad: Nauka, 1979), 74.

253 Uspenskiĭ, *Istoriya krestovyykh pokhodov*, 5 and 10; Idem, *Istoriya Vizantiyskoy imperii*, 3, 78–82 and 139.

254 Idem, “Dvizheniye narodov iz Tsentral'noy Azii v Yevropu. I. Turki. II. Mongoly.”

255 Alexandr Vasiliev, “Moi vospominaniya o V.G. Vasil'yevskom,” *SK* 11 (1940), 207–14.

256 On the Seminarium Kondakovianum as an institution, see: Laurens Hamilton Rhineland, “Exiled Russian Scholars in Prague: The Kondakov Seminar and Institute,” *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 16 (1974), 331–52.

257 Alexandr G. Grushevoĭ, “K perezdaniyu tsikla obshchikh rabot A.A. Vasil'yeva po istorii Vizantii,” in Alexandr Vasiliev, *Istoriya Vizantiyskoy Imperii 324–1453*, vol. 1, *Vremya*

investigations into Arab-Byzantine relations and history of the Goths in Crimea,<sup>258</sup> Vasiliev's great achievement lay in his general surveys of Byzantine history. In 1917–25, he published a four-volume *History of the Byzantine Empire*. In a revised and enlarged form, this work was translated into many languages.

In the first two volumes, Vasiliev came down on the side of his mentor regarding the role of Byzantium's struggle with the North Pontic nomads in the 11th century in the weakening of the empire,<sup>259</sup> the assessment of Turkic nomads' relations with Balkan heretics,<sup>260</sup> and the problem of the genesis of the First Crusade.<sup>261</sup> At the same time, Vasiliev delved even deeper into the subject of Byzantium, the West, and the Crusades, devoting to it an entire chapter, "The First Crusade and Byzantium."<sup>262</sup> As observed by Alexandr Grushevoi, despite having gone through numerous editions in various languages, Vasiliev's *History of the Byzantine Empire* did not become as popular as, for instance, the later work by George Ostrogorsky, or as frequently cited as Uspenskiĭ's general study on the subject.<sup>263</sup> However, Vasiliev's globally recognized book greatly popularized Vasilievskii's thesis about the Pecheneg-Uz-Cuman threat to Byzantium among American and European scholars, who had previously seen only one serious danger to Constantinople before the First Crusade – the Seljuk Turks. Interest among students of Byzantium towards the empire's northern borderlands grew accordingly, becoming evident already after World War II at several congresses of Byzantine studies. Vasiliev also wrote a number of articles

---

*do Krestovykh pokhodov*, ed. transl, comment. Alexandr G. Grushevoi (Saint Petersburg: Aleteyya, 1998), 5–18.

258 In his work on the Goths in Crimea, Vasiliev asserted that "the growing power of the Patzinaks in the Crimea meant a corresponding decline, and finally the collapse, of the Khazar predominance in the Peninsula": Alexandr Vasiliev, *The Goths in the Crimea* (Cambridge, Mass.: The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1936), 116. Vasiliev also considered the Cuman ascendancy in the peninsula from the beginning of the 11th century until 1204 as an indisputable fact: *Ibid.*, 136.

259 In the first volume of *The History of Byzantium*, one of the chapters is entitled "The Pecheneg Problem": Alexandr Vasiliev, *Lektsii po istorii Vizantii*, vol. 1, *Vremya do Krestovykh pokhodov (do 1081 goda)*. (Petrograd: Tipografiya Ya. Bashmakov i K<sup>o</sup>, 1917), 345–6. In the second volume, Byzantine-nomadic relations are considered in the chapter entitled "The Empire's Struggle with the Turks and Pechenegs before the First Crusade and International Relations in the Balkans": *Idem*, *Vizantiya i krestonostsy*, 17–23.

260 *Ibid.*

261 *Ibid.*, 28.

262 *Ibid.*, 23–36.

263 Before the mid-20th century, there were very few general histories of Byzantium written by a single author. Most of those that existed belonged to students and followers of Vasilievskii. Aside from Vasiliev's, these were works by Yu. Kulakovskii, F. Uspenskiĭ, and G. Ostrogorsky.

and reviews on the history of Byzantium in the 10th and 11th centuries touching on the subject of Byzantine-nomadic relations.<sup>264</sup>

Popularized and built upon by Vasiliev and Uspenskiĭ, Vasilievskii's scholarly legacy in the field of the history of Byzantine-Turkic relations had a powerful influence on the Eurasianists as well.<sup>265</sup> Perhaps for the first time ever, Russian scholarship treated the Turkic peoples not as "dark hordes" from which Russia was destined to protect civilized Europe, including Byzantium, but as equal participants in the movement of history and as creators of a rich cultural tradition, directly involved in the formation of several Eastern European states, including Muscovy-Russia and Bulgaria. The very possibility of classifying peoples as "advanced" or "backward" was disputed. The Eurasianists also called into question the existence of an essential antagonism between the sedentary way of life and the nomadic,<sup>266</sup> introduced new research methods, including so-called "linguistic structuralism,"<sup>267</sup> and rethought the role of geographical factors in history.<sup>268</sup> This novel approach to the role of nomads in the history of Russia, and Europe in general, led to a more sustained interest in nomadic history as such, various aspects of which, including Byzantine-nomadic relations, were discussed even in popular journalism.<sup>269</sup> Nomadic influence on the

- 
- 264 Alexandr Vasiliev, "[Review of:] Chalandon F., *Essai sur le règne d'Alexis I-er Comnène (1081-1118)*. Paris: A. Picard et Fils, éditeurs, 1900. LII + 346 p.," *VizVrem* 12 (1906), 266–70; Idem, "[Review of:] Ferdinand Chalandon, *Les Comnènes. Études sur l'Empire Byzantin au XI et au XII siècles. II. Jean II Comnène (1118-1143) et Manuel I Comnène (1143-1180)*. Paris: Librairie A. Picard et Fils. 1912. LXII + 709 str. 8°," *VizVrem* 21 (1914), no. 2, 1–3; Idem, "[Review of:] V. N. Zlatarski, *Istoriya na Bŭlgarskata dŭrzhava prezŭ srednite vekove*, T. 1–2," *BZ* 28 (1928), 407–11; Idem, "The Opening Stages of the Anglo-Saxon Immigration to Byzantium in the Eleventh Century," *SK* 9 (1937), 39–70. It is also important to note that Vasiliev mentored another well-known Byzantinologist – Peter Charanis, some of whose works deal with problems previously raised by Vasilievskii. We may speak of a certain academic tradition here, at least as far as their areas of interest are concerned.
- 265 On Eurasianism, see: *Russia between East and West: Scholarly Debates on Eurasianism*, ed. Dmitry Shlapentokh (International Studies in Sociology and Social Anthropology, 109) (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2007).
- 266 Pëtr N. Savitskiĭ, "Step' i osedlost'," in *Rossiya mezhdū Yevropoy i Aziyey: yevraziyskiy soblazn*, ed. Lidiya I. Novikova and Irina N. Sizemskaya (Moscow: Nauka, 1993), 123–30 [first published in 1922].
- 267 Mikhail M. Kirichenko, "Strukturalizm prazhskogo kruzhka i yevraziystvo: obzor knigi Patrika Serio 'Struktura i Total'nost'," *Sotsiologicheskii zhurnal* (2001), no. 2, 159–76.
- 268 George Vernadsky, the author of a five-volume *History of Russia* and a number of articles that became programmatic for the Eurasianists, deserves special credit in this area. One such seminal article of his was "The Mongol Yoke in Russian History": George Vernadsky, "Mongol'skoye igo v russkoy istorii," *Yevraziyskiy vremennik* 5 (1927), 153–64.
- 269 Pëtr M. Bicilli, "'Vostok' i 'Zapad' v istorii Starogo Sveta," in *Rossiya mezhdū Yevropoy i Aziyey: yevraziyskiy soblazn*, 24–35 [first published in 1922].

culture of the peoples of Eastern Europe attracted broad attention as well.<sup>270</sup> The legacy of the Eurasianists became one of the main factors that inspired and shaped the oeuvre of the Russian Orientalist Lev Gumilyov.

The work of many Eurasianists was connected with the already mentioned Seminarium Kondakovianum (1931–52). Launched with the assistance of the government of Czecho-Slovakia,<sup>271</sup> from 1927 to 1940 this institution published eleven volumes of the academic journal *Seminarium Kondakovianum*,<sup>272</sup> which held its own against the leading Byzantine studies periodicals of the time, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* and *Byzantion*. Given SK's considerable reputation in the academic world, it is important to note that one of its leading themes was the history of the nomads of Eastern Europe and their relations with the region's sedentary states. Articles by Bratskus,<sup>273</sup> Rásonyi,<sup>274</sup> Ostrogorsky,<sup>275</sup> Vasiliev,<sup>276</sup> and Zlatarski<sup>277</sup> were representative of this interest.

Of particular significance were a number of studies by Dmitrii Rasovskiĭ, the most important of which – “The Pechenegs, Torks, and Berendei in Rus' and Ugria”<sup>278</sup> and “The Cumans”<sup>279</sup> – are cited in most of the subsequent scholarship on the history of the medieval nomads of Eastern Europe.

The first of these pieces sets out to explore Turkic presence in Rus' and Hungary “... and particularly the question of [Turkic] settlement in the borderlands of these states,”<sup>280</sup> as well as to throw light on the chronology and circumstances of these nomadic peoples' appearance there, their relations with local political structures, military service, conversion to Christianity, and their footprint in the local toponymy. Step by step, Rasovskiĭ traces the history of the nomads' arrival in Hungary and considers the routes of their migrations,

270 Nikolai S. Trubetskoĭ, “O turanskom elemente v russkoy kul'ture,” *EthnOboz* (1992), no. 1, 92–106 [first published in 1925].

271 Zuzana Skálová, “Das Prager Seminarium Kondakovianum, später das Archäologische Kondakov-Institut und sein Archiv (1925-1952),” *Slavica Gandensia* 18, 1991, 21–49.

272 Initially, the Seminar published *Recueil d'études, dédiées à la mémoire de N. P. Kondakov. Archéologie. Histoire de l'art. Études byzantines*, and later – *Sbornik statey po arkheologii i vizantinovedeniyu* and *Annales de l'Institut Kondakov*.

273 Yuriĭ D. Bratskus, “Varyagi i kolbyagi,” *SK* 7 (1935), 81–102.

274 László Rásonyi, “Der Volksname *Берендѣи*,” *SK* 6 (1933), 219–26.

275 George Ostrogorsky, “V.G. Vasil'yevskiy kak vizantolog i tvorets noveyshey russkoy vizantologii,” *SK* 11, 1940, 227–35.

276 Vasiliev, “The opening stages of the Anglo-Saxon immigration.”

277 Zlatarski, “Ustroystvo Bolgarii i polozheniye Bolgarskogo naroda.”

278 Dmitriĭ A. Rasovskiĭ, “Pechenegi, torki i berendei na Rusi i v Ugrii,” *SK* 6 (1933), 1–64.

279 Idem, “Polovtsy,” *SK* 7 (1935), 245–62; *SK* 8 (1936), 161–82; *SK* 9 (1937), 71–85; *SK* 10 (1938), 155–78; *SK* 11 (1940), 95–128.

280 Rasovskiĭ, “Pechenegi, torki i berendei na Rusi i v Ugrii [part 1],” 2.

their first settlements, and conflicts with local rulers. He often connects the goings-on in Hungary with nomad-related events in Byzantium and Rus', draws parallels between them, and demonstrates correlation. The article is also important for its survey of the entire historiography of the history of the Pechenegs and Uzes in Hungary, Rus', and the Balkan Peninsula to date, and especially for familiarizing the non-Hungarian speaking reader with a broad swath of Hungarian historical scholarship since the beginning of the 19th century. It occupies a central place in the study of Byzantium's relations with the Pechenegs and Uzes as the first study to systematically consider nomadic settlement within the borders of a farming-based, sedentary state and their military service for the local rulers. Overall, it was a kind of continuation of the monumental study by P. Golubovskii, presenting a broad picture of the history of the Turkic nomads of the 9th to 13th centuries in Eastern Europe, including Byzantium.

Rasovskii's "Polovtsy," published in *SK* in as many as five installments, represents an even larger undertaking. The series attempts to encompass the history of the Cumans as fully as possible both chronologically (beginning with their earliest appearances in Asian sources) and geographically, and to examine a range of key aspects of their life – from economic to military. He offers an extensive bibliography and discusses various historiographical issues. A large part of the article tackles the Cumans' relations with Byzantium.<sup>281</sup> The history of the Cumans' and other nomadic groups' international connections and contacts was further considered by Rasovskii in several other articles.<sup>282</sup>

Certain changes in the study of nomadism took place in early Soviet historiography as well. Chief among them were a (temporary) departure from viewing Russo-nomadic relations as essentially antagonistic and the beginning of a systematic exploration of the archaeological remains of various medieval nomads within the Soviet borders.

Mikhail Pokrovskii, offering a Marxist analysis of Russian scholarship of the 19th and early 20th century, criticized Sergeĭ Solovyov's conception of "the struggle between the forest and the steppe," underlying much of

281 Rasovskii wrote a special essay on this topic: "Les Comans et Byzance," *Izvestiya na Bŭlgarskiya arkhologicheski institut* 9 (1935), 346–54. See also: Idem, "Rol' polovtsev v voynakh Aseney s Vizantiyskoy i Latinskoy imperiyami v 1186-1207 gg.," *Spisanie na BAN* 58 (1939), 203–11.

282 Idem, "O roli Chernykh Klobukov v istorii Drevney Rusi," *SK* 1 (1927), 93–109; Idem, "K voprosu o proiskhozhdenii Codex Cumanicus," *SK* 3 (1929), 193–214; Idem, "Khinova," *SK* 8 (1936), 307–13; Idem, "Tl'koviny," *SK* 8 (1936), 301–6; Idem, "Rus', Chernyye Klobuki i Polovtsy v XII v.," *Izvestiya na Bŭlgarskoto Istoricheskoto druzhestvo* 16–18 (1940), 369–78.

pre-revolutionary research on nomads in Russia.<sup>283</sup> A new approach to the medieval nomads and their relations with their neighbors was characteristic of the works of Alexandr Yakubovskii,<sup>284</sup> Serafim Yushkov,<sup>285</sup> Vladimir Gordlevskii,<sup>286</sup> Ahatanhel Kryms'kyi,<sup>287</sup> and Vasilii Bartold.<sup>288</sup>

One of the leading Russian Orientalists, Vasilii Bartold (1869–1930) published a number of texts by Eastern authors relating to the Pechenegs and Uzes and studied these peoples' political history and their relations with European nations. He saw the Pechenegs as part of an Oghuz conglomerate of tribes that advanced toward the Volga and further west at the end of the 9th century, marking the Oghuzes' first appearance in Europe. Another group of tribes subjugated several Muslim countries and regions.<sup>289</sup> Bartold compared the consequences of choosing the European or Asian route to the West: in the first case, the Uzes were exterminated and dissolved in other ethnic groups, and in the second they succeeded in Turkifying Asia Minor and Northern Iran.<sup>290</sup> In general, Yakubovskii, Gordlevskii, and Bartold were unanimous in seeing the European and Asian routes of the Turks' westward migration as parts of the same process – at first defeated in Europe, they came out on top in Asia Minor and eventually proceeded to try and conquer Europe once again.

283 Vladimir A. Gurko-Kriazhyn, "Pokrovs'kyy i vyvchennyya istoriyi Skhodu," *SSv* (1929), no. 1–2, 267–85; *Kiyevskaya Rus' i kochevniki*, 46–52.

284 Alexandr D. Yakubovskii, "Sel'dzhuzskoye dvizheniye i turkmeny v XI veke," *Izvestiya AN SSSR, Otd. obshchestvennykh nauk* 4 (1937), no. 1, 921–46; Idem, "Voprosy etnogeneza turkmen v VIII–X vv.," *SovEthn* (1947) no. 3, 48–54.

285 *Kiyevskaya Rus' i kochevniki*, 53–4.

286 *Ibid.*, 57.

287 Ahatanhel Yu. Kryms'kyi, "Tyurky, yikh movy ta literatury," in his *Tvory v 5-ty tomakh*, vol. 4, *Skhodoznavstvo* (Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1974), 447–583 [first published in 1930].

288 Vasilii V. Bartold, "Tyurki," in his *Sochineniya*, vol. 5, *Raboty po istorii i filologii tyurkskikh i mongol'skikh narodov* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Vostochnoy literatury, 1968), 576–95 [first published in 1908]; Idem, "Dvenadtsat' lektsiy po istorii tyurkskikh narodov Sredney Azii," in *Sochineniya*, 5, 19–192 [first published in 1927] (Uz-Byzantine relations are also considered); Idem, "Khazary" in *Sochineniya*, 5, 597–601 [first published in 1908]; Idem, "Kipchaki," in *Sochineniya*, 5, 550–1 [first published in 1908]. About Bartold: Olga P. Zhalmenova, "U istokov rossiyskogo sredioziasiatovedeniya: nauchno-pedagogicheskaya deyatel'nost' V.V. Bartol'da," *Stavropol'skiy al'manakh Obshchestva intellektual'noy istorii* (2003), no. 3, 158–74. Bartold was the first scholar to put out a facsimile edition of the *Hudud al-'Alam*, a Persian treatise on geography containing information on the areas of habitation of Turkic nomads, and to edit works by Abu Sa'id Gardizī, Sadiduddin Muhammad 'Awfi, and other authors: *Orientalische Berichte über die Völker Osteuropas*, 35–9 and 47.

289 Bartold, "Dvenadtsat' lektsiy po istorii," 76–7 and 91.

290 Idem, "Guzz," in *Sochineniya*, 5, 525. Bartold thought that the term *Ghuzz* was an Arab variation on the name *Oghuz*, and Uzes were the same as Torks: *Ibid.*, 524–7.

In a paper presented at an archaeological conference in 1927, the Ukrainian scholar Volodymyr Parkhomenko (1880–1942), one of the creators of the “southern” theory of the origins of Rus’, proposed to rethink the traditional view of Russo-nomadic relations. He laid out the basics of his approach in the article “Rus’ and the Pechenegs.”<sup>291</sup> In his view, the entire history of Rus’ from the 9th to early 11th century was that of a struggle between the Pecheneg Steppe and the Varangian North. From the very beginnings of the Rus’ state, the Pechenegs constituted its ruling elite and defended the so-called “Polianian” Rus’ of Yaropolk and Sviatopolk against the “Drevlianian” Rus’ of Volodimir the Great, Boris and Yaroslav Volodimirovichs, and the Varangians. The struggle between the Pechenegs and Varangians reached its peak in 980–1036: “In the events of 1036, the Pechenegs are rather the defenders of Polianian Kyiv.”<sup>292</sup> According to Parkhomenko, it was the defeat of the Pechenegs, unable to protect Polianian statehood from foreign encroachments, in this war that caused their relocation to the Lower Danube, where they came face to face with Byzantium.<sup>293</sup>

In a number of other works,<sup>294</sup> Parkhomenko developed his conception of the great role of nomads in Rus’ state building, disputed the established view of nomads as medieval barbarians, and tried to find ethnogenetic ties between the Turks and the peoples of the Caucasus. His ideas became known to the wider European public when the article “Rus’ and the Pechenegs” was reprinted in the Prague journal *Slavia*.<sup>295</sup>

The Leningrad historian Mikhail Priselkov (1881–1941) hypothesized a close connection between Russo-Byzantine relations and anti-nomadic struggle. In a 1938 article, he explained the vicissitudes of Russo-Cuman interactions in the 12th century by Byzantine interference.<sup>296</sup> In 1939, Priselkov expanded

291 Volodymyr O. Parkhomenko, “Rus’ ta pechenihy. Do spravy starodavnikh zv’yazkiv Rusy zi Skhodom,” *SSv* 7–8 (1929), 287–94.

292 *Ibid.*, 290.

293 *Ibid.*, 292.

294 Volodymyr O. Parkhomenko, “Pro kul’turu tyurkiv nashoho stepu IX–XIII v.v.,” *SSv* 3–4 (1928), 307–9; *Idem*, “Chorni klobuky,” *SSv* 5 (1928), 242–6; *Idem*, “Rus’ ta pechenihy. Do spravy starodavnikh zv’yazkiv Rusy zi Skhodom”; *Idem*, “Kahanat Rusy,” *SSv* 7–8 (1929), 357–9; *Idem*, “K istorii derzhavy Ryurikovichy. (Obzor literatury za 1938 g.),” *VDI* (1939), no. 3, 144–7. A number of these articles appeared in the journal of Ukrainian Orientalists *Skhidnyi Svit* (Eastern World), published by the All-Ukrainian Scholarly Association of Oriental Studies. See: Mariya F. Dmytriyenko, “Zhurnal ‘Skhidnyy svit’ (1927–1931). Istoriohrafichnyy ohlyad,” *Istoriohrafichni doslidzhennya v Ukrayins’kii RSR* (1969), no. 2, 189–98.

295 *Kiyevskaya Rus’ i kochevniki*, 52.

296 Parkhomenko, “K istorii derzhavy Ryurikovichy. (Obzor literatury za 1938 g.),” 144–5.

his argument chronologically, seeing a “Byzantine footprint” in all of the Rus’ state’s nomad-related activities.<sup>297</sup> In his view, as early as 1037 Rus’ entered into an alliance with Byzantium against the steppe peoples, which alliance persisted until the Mongol invasion of the 13th century. Even earlier, Byzantium had fought against nomads using the Kyivan princes Sviatoslav, Volodimir, and Volodimir’s brother, Sfengus.<sup>298</sup>

Priselkov’s conception was based on those episodes in “Byzantium and the Pechenegs” where Vasilievskii particularly noted Byzantium’s turning to Rus’ for help when facing nomadic threats. The Soviet scholar absolutized such cases and raised them to the rank of a principle of Byzantine and Rus’ foreign policy. Unsurprisingly, the idea met with no support in Soviet historiography, mainly because it called into question the sovereignty of the princes of Rus’, detecting a decisive influence of Byzantine diplomacy in their actions.<sup>299</sup>

In the late 1930s, official Soviet historiography, represented by Boris Grekov’s monograph *Kyivan Rus’* (1939), revived the traditional tenets of Russian scholarship in the interpretation of nomadic history. Rus’ was portrayed as the state of Eastern Slavs heroically defending Europe, including Byzantium, against nomadic menace.<sup>300</sup>

Overall, a survey of the Soviet periodicals of the 1920s and 1930s<sup>301</sup> shows a dearth of research on the history of relations between Byzantium and the Turkic nomads of the North Pontic steppes. Occasional works in Byzantine

297 Mikhail D. Priselkov, “Russko-vizantiyskiye otnosheniya IX–XII vv.,” *VDI* (1939), no. 3, 98–109.

298 *Ibid.*, 98–103. This article by Priselkov suffers from some inaccuracies. For instance, he wrote of a joint Pecheneg-Cuman raid on Constantinople in 1091 (“Russko-vizantiyskiye otnosheniya IX–XII vv.,” 106.), even though in fact it was the Cumans who helped Constantinople to defeat the Pechenegs in this episode. Such errors are surprising, because in his description of Byzantium’s dealings with the trans-Danubian nomads Priselkov relied on Vasilievskii’s “Byzantium and the Pechenegs.”

299 Zinaida V. Udaltsova, *Sovetskoye vizantinovedeniye za 50 let* (Moscow: Nauka, 1969), 112–3.

300 Grekov, *Kiyevskaya Rus’*, 468–71. A number of Grekov’s works are rife with unabashed Russian chauvinism. See, for instance, Boris D. Grekov, “Inostrantsy o slavyano-russkom voyske,” *Istoricheskij zhurnal* (1941), no. 9, 103–9.

301 On this era’s history periodicals in the USSR, see: Alevtina I. Alatorseva, “Sovetskaya istoricheskaya periodika serediny 30-kh–kontsa 50-kh godov,” in *Istoriya i istoriki. Istoriograficheskij yezhegodnik. 1977*, ed. Militsa V. Nechkina (Moscow: Nauka, 1980), 364–81.



studies<sup>302</sup> or ethnography<sup>303</sup> touched on this subject. Some articles exhibit a very low standard of scholarship.<sup>304</sup>

Perhaps the lack of new departures in nomadic history in pre-war Soviet historiography can be explained by the lack of new sources for its study. Pre-revolutionary historians had thoroughly explored the available evidence by the end of the 19th century, and the early 20th century saw only the development of new approaches to the same factual material.

Under these circumstances, the ball was in archaeology's court as far as nomadic studies were concerned. Despite the purges of the 1930s,<sup>305</sup> during that decade the discipline made a real leap in its development.<sup>306</sup> A striking example of its potential in filling in historical blanks was the investigation of

- 
- 302 Alexandra F. Vishniakova, "Svintsovyye pechati vizantiyskogo Khersonesa," *VDI* (1939) no. 1, 121–33; Arsenii N. Nasonov, "Tmutorokan' v istorii Vostochnoy Yevropy X veka," in *Istoricheskiye zapiski*, 6, ed. Boris D. Grekov (Moscow, 1940), 79–99; Mstislav A. Shangin, "Zapiska grecheskogo toparkha kak istochnik o voyne russkikh na Balkanakh 970 goda i zimoy 971 goda," *Istoricheskiy zhurnal* (1941), no. 9, 121–3.
- 303 Particularly the ethnographic study of Bessarabia authored by Lev Berg (1876–1950), which dealt extensively with the Gagauzes: Lev S. Berg, *Bessarabiya. Strana – Lyudi – Khozyaystvo* (Chişinău: Universitas, 1993), 124–6 [first published in 1918].
- 304 See, for instance, A. Ponomaryov, "Kuman-polovtsy," *VDI* (1940), no. 3–4, 366–70. In a study of the historiography of the Pereyaslav Council, Oleksiï Yas' also notes a doctrinal shift in Soviet historiography during the 1930s towards a more primitive, schematic approach and Russian imperial chauvinism: Oleksiï Yas', "Obrazy Pereyaslava v ukraïyns'kiy istoriografii akademichnoyi doby (pochatok XIX – kinets' 80-kh rokiv XX stolittya)," in *Pereyaslavs'ka Rada 1654 roku. Istoriohrafiiya ta doslidzhennya*, eds. Pavlo S. Sokhan' et al. (Kyiv: Smoloskyp, 2003), 585.
- 305 In 1930 in Leningrad, Vladislav Ravdonikas published his book *For a Marxist History of Material Culture*, directed against archaeology. The very term "archaeology" was suppressed at that time as old-regime and replaced with "history of material culture." The old name of the discipline was restored only in 1935: (Sergiï I. Bilokin', "Nezrealizovane vydannya shestytomnoyi istoriyi ukraïyns'koho mystetstva (1930–1931)," *Studii mystetstvoznavchi* 2 (30) (2010), 59). Among others, the Stalinist purges affected Pavel Rykov and his students, who were working on medieval nomadic burials in the Volga region: Svetlana A. Pletnyova, *Kochevniki yuzhnorusskikh stepy v epokhu srednevekov'ya (IV–XIII veka)*, 121. See also: Lev S. Klein, *Fenomen sovetskoy arkheologii* (Saint Petersburg: FARN, 1993), 16–24.
- 306 *Problemnaya situatsiya v sovremennoy arkheologii*, ed. Volodymyr F. Gening (Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1988), 61. See also: Volodymyr F. Gening, *Ocherki istorii sovetskoy arkheologii. (U istokov formirovaniya marksistskikh teoreticheskikh osnov sovetskoy arkheologii. 20-ye – pervaya polovina 30-kh godov)* (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1982); Petro Kurinnyi, *Istoriya arkheolohichnoho znannya pro Ukraïynu* (Munich: Ukraïyns'kyy Vil'nyy Universytet, 1970); Ivan G. Shovkoplias, *Arkheolohichni doslidzhennya na Ukraïyni (1917–1957). Ohlyad vyvchennya arkheolohichnykh pam'yatok* (Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo Akademiyi nauk URSR, 1957).

the Khazar<sup>307</sup> fortress of Sarkel by Mikhail Artamonov. As a result of his large-scale (by the standards of the time) excavations on the so-called Tsimlyansky settlement in 1934–36, he was able to prove that this was indeed the Sarkel fortress figuring in the written sources, the construction of which began in the 830s.<sup>308</sup> Further research in the region after 1949 laid the foundation for the archaeological study of medieval nomads in the USSR. Excavations of the burials of medieval nomads in Crimea were carried out by Nikolaï Ernst.<sup>309</sup> Nomadic burials in the Dnieper region were studied by Mykhaylo Miller, Volodymyr Grinchenko, and Trokhym Teslya;<sup>310</sup> in Donbas – by Petro Pinevych, Victor Yevsieyev, and Mykola Makarenko.<sup>311</sup> Accidental finds of nomadic burials were also not uncommon both north of the Black Sea<sup>312</sup> and in the region of the Ural Mountains.<sup>313</sup>

## 2.5 *10th- to 11th-Century Relations between Byzantium and Trans-Danubian Nomads in International Byzantine Studies*

When “Byzantium and the Pechenegs” came out, the field of Byzantine studies was in the early stages of its development. Hence, the appearance of that work did not cause any noticeable stir in academic periodicals. It can be argued that in Europe (outside of Russia) only a narrow circle of scholars specializing in Byzantine history were familiar with it. However, it did not pass entirely unnoticed.

- 
- 307 However, the Khazar identity of a number of sites between the Volga and Don remains in dispute: Gennadiï E. Afanas'ev, “Gde zhe arkheologicheskiye svitel'stva sushchestvovaniya khazarskogo gosudarstva?” *RosArkh* (2001), no. 2, 43–55.
- 308 Pletnyova, “Saltovo-mayatskaya kul'tura,” 63. Two important works by Artamonov came out of this period of fieldwork: Mikhail I. Artamonov, *Srednevekovyye poseleniya na Nizhnem Donu. Po materialam Severo-Kavkazskoy ekspeditsii* (Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoye sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoye izdatel'stvo, 1935); Idem, *Ocherki drevneyshey istorii khazar* (Leningrad: Sotsekgiz, 1936).
- 309 Cherepanova and Shchepinskiï, “Pogrebeniya pozdnykh kochevnikov v stepnom Krymu,” 181. On the devastation wreaked on Crimean archaeology in the 1930s, see: Vladislav Yu. Yurochkin, “Gotskiy vopros' sovetskoy nauke 20-kh gg. XX v.,” *Arkheologicheskîy al'manakh* 25 (2011), 240–9.
- 310 Petro P. Lesnichii and Volodymyr N. Shalobudov, “K istorii izucheniya pozdnekochevnicheskikh drevnostey Severnogo Podneprov'ya,” in *Problemy arkheolohiyi Podniprov'ya*, ed. Iryna F. Kovalyova (Dnipropetrovsk: RVV DNU, 2003), 111.
- 311 Roman O. Litvinenko, “Svod dannykh ob issledovaniyakh kurganov na territorii Donetskoy oblasti v XX veke,” *Arkheologicheskîy al'manakh* 14, (2004), 68–71.
- 312 Yulii Marti, “Gorodishcha Bosporskogo tsarstva k yugu ot Kerchi (Kimmerik, Kitey, Akra),” *Izvestiya Tavricheskogo Obshchestva Istorii, Arkheologii i Etnografii* 2 (59) (1928), 110.
- 313 Garustovich and Ivanov, *Materialy po arkheologii srednevekovykh kochevnikov Yuzhnogo Urala*, 106–125.

The appearance in the newly-founded journal *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* of Karl Dieter's 1894 article "On the Reliability of Anna Komnene. The Pecheneg War of 1084–91"<sup>314</sup> – perhaps the first study since the publication of "Byzantium and the Pechenegs" to consider Byzantine-Pecheneg relations – did not mark the emergence of an interest in this topic among Western European Byzantinologists. The article reconsidered the chronology of the events of the Byzantine-Pecheneg war of the late 11th century proposed by Vasilievskii.<sup>315</sup>

In the same issue of the *BZ*, the German scholar Carl Neumann conjectured that two groups figuring in the sources as ethnic units of the Byzantine army (the *Κουλήγγοι* and *Ταμάτζιοι*) were in fact Pecheneg.<sup>316</sup> Unlike Dieter, Neumann paid more attention to the Pechenegs themselves. He took into consideration a wider circle of Byzantine sources mentioning this people, as well as some recent scholarship, including "Byzantium and the Pechenegs" and the monograph by Golubovskii.

Despite the limited nature of the subject declared in its title, Neumann's article attempted a broad survey of Pecheneg-Byzantine relations. Chronologically, he distinguished two phases in their evolution – from the Pechenegs' first appearance in the northern Black Sea steppes to the murder of Sviatoslav

314 Karl Dieter, "Zur Glaubwürdigkeit der Anna Komnena. Der Petschenegenkrieg 1084–1091," *BZ* 3, (1894), 386–90.

315 The starting point of the critique was Vasilievskii's erroneous dating of the solar eclipse mentioned by Anna Komnene (1088). Dieter pointed out that the eclipse of 20 July 1088 was not observable in the Balkans, and thus we need an earlier (1 August 1087) or later (24 November 1090) date for the negotiations between Alexios Komnenos and the Pechenegs marked by a solar eclipse. Dieter, "Zur Glaubwürdigkeit der Anna Komnena," 390. See also: Yakov N. Lyubarskii, "Vizantiysko-pechenezhskaya voyna 1086–1091 gg. na territorii Balkan," in *Slavyanskije issledovaniya. Materialy 2-y Velikorusskoy mezhvuzovskoy konferentsii po istorii slavyanskikh stran*, ed. Askold I. Doronchenkov (Leningrad: Lenizdat, 1966), 3–9. There have been many other revisions to the chronology of events proposed in "Byzantium and the Pechenegs": Yakov N. Lyubarskii "[Review of:] Gautier P., 'Le Discours de Thèophylacte de Bulgarie à l'autocrator Alexis I-er Comnene (6 janvier 1088),' *Revue des Études Byzantines*, XX, 1962, p. 93–130," *VizVrem* 25 (1964), 269–70. In spite of this, as Liubarskii observed in the same review, Vasilievskii's largely hypothetical chronology continued to roam across Byzantine studies, from one work into another.

316 Carl Neumann, "Über zwei unerklärte Völkernamen in der byzantinischen Armee (Kulpinger und Talmatzer)," *BZ* 3 (1894), 375. Aleksei Sobolevskii criticized the article, noting that these ethnic names could only have belonged to the Rus' and Varangians: Alexei I. Sobolevskii, "Κουλήγγοι i Ταμάτζιοι: Po povodu stat'i Neymana v Byzantinische Zeitschrift III (1894) 364 сл.," *VizVrem* 12 (1894), 460–1. See also: Mikhail K. Yurasov, "Neslavyanskije narody Vostochnoy Yevropy v 'deyaniyakh Vengrov' neizvestnogo notariya korolya Bely III," *Istoriya. Vestnik Nizhegorodskogo universiteta im. N. I. Lobachevskogo* (2015) no. 2, 73–4.

and from 971 to the 12th century. In his view, during the first phase the Pechenegs generally played the role of an instrument of Byzantine policy in the region, and Crimea was the only imperial province disturbed by them.<sup>317</sup> Furthermore, it was during this time that first Pechenegs entered Byzantine military service (as Ταλμάτζιοι). The second phase was marked by an open confrontation between the nomads and the empire, but in the end the Pechenegs again were drawn into Byzantine service. Neumann found reports of the presence of Pecheneg fighters in the Byzantine ranks in 12th-century Armenian sources.<sup>318</sup>

In the early 20th century, the Pechenegs were already firmly ensconced among “the Byzantine peoples” in the academic perception.<sup>319</sup> Even though Byzantinologists still knew little to nothing about their pre-European past, they were appearing in the pages of Byzantinological periodicals more and more often. Thus, Eduard Kurtz once again argued that, in most cases, the term Σκύθαι should be seen as referring to the Pechenegs.<sup>320</sup> The Swiss historian Ernest Mamboury found Pechenegs among the guards of the Adrianople Gate in Constantinople.<sup>321</sup>

Another Western European scholar who considered the Pechenegs for their own sake was the British (self-identified Irish) historian Carlile Aylmer Macartney (1895–1978). Studying the early medieval Magyars<sup>322</sup> and sources for their history,<sup>323</sup> he turned his attention to the Pechenegs, without whom it was impossible to imagine the history of Hungary and Eastern Europe in general. His 1930 article “The Pechenegs”<sup>324</sup> drew on a wide range of sources (Oriental, Hungarian, Rus’, and Greek) to trace the history of these nomads,

317 Neumann, “Über zwei unerklärte Völkernamen,” 379.

318 Ibid., 385.

319 See, for instance, Eugène Pittard, “Ethnologie de la Péninsule des Balkans,” *Le Globe. Revue genevoise de géographie* 43 (1904), no. 1, 26–27, 31 and 89.

320 Eduard Kurtz, “Unedierte Texte aus der Zeit des Kaisers Johannes Komnenos,” *BZ* 16 (1907), 86.

321 Ernest Mamboury, “Notes d’archéologie: Ruines byzantines. Autour d’Odalar-Djamissi, à Stamboul,” *Échos d’Orient* 19 (1920), no. 117, 69.

322 Carlile A. Macartney, *The Magyars in the Ninth Century* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1930).

323 Idem, *Studies on the Earliest Hungarian Historical Sources*, 7 vols, 8 parts (Budapest/Oxford: Sárkány Lim., 1938–1952); Idem, “Studies on the Earliest Hungarian Historical Sources. Extras,” *AECO* 4 (1938) no. 4, 1–35; Idem, *Studies on the Earliest Hungarian Historical Sources*, vol. 6, *The Origin of the Hun Chronicle and Hungarian Historical Sources*; vol. 7, *The Origin, Structure and Meaning of the “Hun Chronicle”* (Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1951); Idem, *The Medieval Hungarian Historians: A Critical and Analytical Guide* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1953).

324 Idem, “The Pechenegs,” *SEER* 8 (1929–1930), no. 22, 342–55.

mostly in Eastern Europe, and particularly their relations with Rus' and Byzantium. He dwelled in some depth on their religious beliefs and attempts to baptize them, and on their tribal organization. He also briefly surveyed the Pechenegs' relations with the region's Christian states. Macartney was one of the first scholars to introduce the English-speaking academic audience to the history and culture of this people. His was also one of the few works in which the Pechenegs and their history were the main subject, rather than a sideshow to the history of a particular region, country, or nation. Two years before the publication of Macartney's study, a similar work by Alexander Bruce Boswell about the Cumans appeared in the same journal.<sup>325</sup> In 1930, Macartney published an article on "The Attack on 'Valandar,'"<sup>326</sup> considering al-Mas'udi's report about a nomadic raid on that Byzantine fortress.

An article by Ostrogorsky on the Byzantine state hierarchy also deserves note here. Ostrogorski wrote that the Pechenegs, together with the Magyars and the Rus', occupied high rungs in the Byzantine hierarchy of peoples: their rulers received so-called *Γράμματα*, as opposed to *Κέλευσις*, and in dealing with them emperors used the title "Emperor of the Romei," rather than "Despot," as with peoples under Byzantine rule.<sup>327</sup>

The period of the second half of the 19th to early 20th centuries saw the publication of commented and translated sources relating to 10th- and 11th-century Byzantium and specialized anthologies of source excerpts. Editions of Michael Psellos (including translations and commentaries) came out in Paris (1874 – Konstantinos N. Sathas, 1928 – Émile Renaud) and London (1899 – John Bagnell Bury). Elizabeth Dawes published an English translation of the *Alexiad* (London, 1928), and Bernard Leib translated this source into French with commentary (Paris, 1937–46). In 1912, Karl Dieterich put out a two-volume collection of *Byzantine Sources for the Study of the Peoples and Lands of the 5th to 15th Centuries*,<sup>328</sup> the second volume of which was devoted to nomads. Aiming to create as exhaustive a compendium of Byzantine sources on historical geography and world ethnography as possible, the German scholar translated more than 400 excerpts from the works of more than 60 Greek authors. Special

325 Alexander Bruce Boswell, "The Kipchak Turks," *The Slavonic Review* 6 (1927–1928), 68–85.

326 Carlile Aylmer Macartney, "The Attack on 'Valandar,'" *BNJ* 8 (1929–1930), 159–70. Henri Grégoire also addressed this question: Henri Grégoire, "Le nom des Hongrois," *Byzantion* 12 (1937), 645–50.

327 George Ostrogorsky, "Die byzantinische Staatenhierarchie," *SK* 8 (1936), 49. English version: "The Byzantine Emperor and the Hierarchical World Order," *SEER* 35 (1956), no. 84, 1–14.

328 Karl Dieterich, *Byzantinische Quellen zur Länder- und Völkerkunde 5.–15. Jahrhundert. 2. Das Gebiet der neueren Wandervölker* (Leipzig: Wigand, 1912).

chapters were dedicated to nomads, including the Pechenegs and Cumans. Dieterich also considered such an important issue in source analysis as the use of ethnonyms in Byzantine sources. Franz Dölger (1891–1968) began an extremely interesting project aiming to compile a catalog of all Byzantine imperial documents (*Kaiserurkunden*), both published and unpublished but mentioned in sources across the entire span of Byzantine history.<sup>329</sup>

Anthologizing fragments of Byzantine sources proved a very popular pursuit. Based on the 1840 Bonn edition of the *De Thematibus* and *DAI*, undertaken by August Immanuel Bekker, excerpts from Constantine Porphyrogenitus concerning their respective national histories were published by scholars from Croatia (1877, 1918, 1925), Hungary (1900, 1902, 1937), Serbia (1921), and Russia (1899, 1934).<sup>330</sup> In 1920, the Irish Byzantinologist John Bagnell Bury released a textbook that included excerpts from the *DAI*.<sup>331</sup>

In 1943, Vitalien Laurent (1896–1973), the founder of Byzantine sigillography, published a seal belonging to the *protokouropalates* and *doux* of Philippopolis Argyros Karatzas, who, according to Anna Komnene, was a Scythian. Laurent suggested that Karatzas was of Pecheneg or Cuman extraction and hypothesized a connection between this Byzantine general and the well-known Phanariot family of the *Καρατζάδες*/Caragea.<sup>332</sup>

The history of Byzantium's relations with trans-Danubian nomads was dealt with mainly in source studies or works on local problems of Byzantine

329 *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches von 565–1453*, 5 vols, eds. Franz Dölger et al. (Munich: Verlag C.H. Beck, 1924–1965).

330 "Critical Introduction," in Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Administrando Imperio*, Greek text ed. Gyula Moravcsik, English transl. Romilly J.H. Jenkins (*CFHB*, 1) (Washington, D.C.: Center for Byzantine Studies, 1967), 24–7 (hereafter, quotations from the *DAI* will be given after the *CFHB* edition if not stated otherwise); Lipshits, "Vizantiyskiye pis'mennyye istochniki," 74.

331 *The Early History of the Slavonic Settlements in Dalmatia, Croatia, & Serbia. Constantine Porphyrogenitus De Administrando Imperio, Chapters 29–36*, ed. John Bagnell Bury (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1920).

332 Vitalien Laurent, "Argyros Karatzas, Protokouropalates și Duce de Philippopoli," *RI* 29 (1943), 203–10. See also: Karadža, "Karadža, nume peceneg în toponimia românească," 87–92; Paul Gautier, "Le synode des Blachernes (fin 1094). Etude prosopographique," *RÉB* 29, 1971, 91; Élisabeth Malamut, "L'image byzantine des Petchénègues," *BZ* 88 (1995), no. 1, 146–7; Alexandru Madgearu, "The Pechenegs in the Byzantine Army," in *The Steppe Lands and the World beyond Them*, 214. Another seal of Argyros Karatzas was published by Ivan Iordanov: Ivan Iordanov, "Byzantine lead seals from the stronghold near Dobri Dol, Plovdiv region," *Revue Numismatique*, 157 (2001), 450–1.

history,<sup>333</sup> as well as in general works on the history of Byzantium, Bulgaria, and the Crusades.<sup>334</sup>

Pecheneg-Byzantine relations were addressed in the writings of Alfred Rambaud and Gustave Léon Schlumberger, who studied the Byzantine 10th century,<sup>335</sup> and Ferdinand Chalandon, who in 1900–12 published two

- 
- 333 Some good examples include: Johannes Dräseke, "Johannes Mauropos," *BZ* 2 (1893), 461–93; Dieter, "Zur Glaubwürdigkeit der Anna Komnena"; Robert Schütte, *Der Aufstand des Leon Tornikios im Jahre 1047: eine Studie zur byzantinischen Geschichte des 11. Jahrhunderts* (Plauen: Moritz Wieprecht, 1896); Paul Orgels, "Kekaumenos et la guerre petchénegue," *Byzantion* 13 (1938), 402–8; John Bagnell Bury, "The Ceremonial Book of Constantine Porphyrogenitus," *English Historical Review* 22 (1907), 209–27 and 417–39; Idem, "The treatise De administrando imperio," *BZ* 15 (1906), 517–77; Gavro Manojlović, "Studije o spisu 'De administrando imperio' cara Konstantina VII. Porfirogenita," *Rad Jugoslavenske Akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 74 (1910), no. 182, 1–65; Idem, "Studije o spisu 'De administrando imperio' cara Konstantina VII. Porfirogenita: studija druga," *Rad Jugoslavenske Akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 76 (1911), no. 186, 35–103; Mikhail Ya. Siuziumov, "Ob istochnikakh L'va D'yakona i Skilitsy," *Vizantijskoye Obozreniye* 2 (1916), 106–66; Georgina Buckler, *Anna Comnena. A Study* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1929); Eadem, "Authorship of the Strategikon of Cecaumenus," *BZ* 36 (1936), 7–26; Franz Dölger, "Die Chronologie des grossen Feldzuges des Kaisers Ioannes Tzimiskes gegen die Russen," *BZ* 32 (1932), 275–92; Dawkins, "An Echo in the Norse Sagas of the Patzinak War of John Komninos"; Henri Grégoire, "Byzance, les Khazars, les Magyars et les Petchénègues," *Sixième Congrès International d'Études Byzantines, Alger 2-7 Octobre 1939. Résumés des rapports et communications* (Paris: Comité d'organisation du Congrès, 1940), 6–7.
- 334 August Friedrich Gfrörer, *Byzantinische Geschichten*, vol. 3 (Graz: Vereins-Buchdruckerei, 1877), 474; Heinrich von Sybel, *Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzugs* (Leipzig: Friedrich Fleischer, 1881), 462–3; Gustav Friedrich Hertzberg, *Geschichte der Byzantiner und des Osmanischen Reiches bis gegen Ende des sechszehnten Jahrhunderts* (Berlin: Grote, 1883), 272; Georg Ostrogorsky, *Geschichte des byzantinischen Staates* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1940); Paul Lemerle, *Histoire de Byzance* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1943); Steven Runciman, *A History of the First Bulgarian Empire* (London: G. Bell & Sons Ltd, 1930).
- 335 Alfred Rambaud, *L'Empire grec au dixième siècle; Constantin Porphyrogénète* (Paris: Librairie A. Franck, 1870), 393; Gustave Léon Schlumberger, *L'épopée byzantine à la fin du dixième siècle. Troisième partie, Les porphyrogénètes Zoé et Théodora* (Paris: Hachette, 1905), 201; Idem, *L'épopée byzantine à la fin du dixième siècle: guerres contre les Russes, les Arabes, les Allemands, les Bulgares; luttes civiles contre les deux Bardas. Jean Tzimiscés. Les jeunes années de Basile II, le tueur de Bulgares (969-989)* (Paris: Éditions de Boccard, 1925), 35, 41, 44–45, 47–48, 99, 109, 140, 678. Schlumberger was one of the founders of Byzantine sigillography (Idem, *Sigillographie de l'empire byzantin* (Paris, 1884) – an auxiliary historical discipline that was only beginning to make way for itself in the academic world of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. For instance, an article by Ilarion Sventsits'kyi (1876–1956), a Ukrainian scholar teaching at Lviv University, about Byzantine lead seals from Lviv collections ("Byzantinische Bleisiegel in den Sammlungen von Lwow," *Izvestiya na bulgarskoto istoricheskoto druzhestvo* 16–18 (1940), 434–41) was used by scholars working on the problem of Byzantine administrative organization in the 10th to 12th centuries, including Petre Diaconu. One of these Lviv seals likely belonged to Kekaumenos and

essential works on the Komnenos dynasty.<sup>336</sup> In the introductory chapter of the first book, “The Byzantine Empire after the Death of Basil II,” Chalandon (judging by the references, under the influence of Vasilevskii) emphasized the great danger the Pechenegs posed to the empire in the 11th century.<sup>337</sup> Byzantium’s wars with the Pechenegs in 1084–92 were treated in chapter four of the book, those with the Cumans – in parts of chapter five. Pechenegs were also mentioned among the troops that helped the Byzantine emperor to keep in check the Crusaders in the Balkans. In addition, Chalandon considered the Cuman raid on Byzantium in 1114.<sup>338</sup> While generally following the *Alexiad*, Chalandon paid attention to questions of chronology and to the localization of historical events concerning the Pechenegs. His book was the first since the appearance of “Byzantium and the Pechenegs” to look in such detail at Byzantine-Pecheneg relations.

One may observe that from the mid-19th to the mid-20th century the history of the Byzantine Balkans and adjacent territories in the 10th and 11th centuries was represented in national historiographies mainly by narrative works, such as “Byzantium and the Pechenegs,” *History of Bulgaria in the Middle Ages*, or *Essai sur le règne d’Alexis I-er Comnène*, in which the authors, based on the available sources, tried to tell a coherent story that would push the reader to specific conclusions. In a typical study from another group (let us call this group philological-historical), the author endeavored to connect a particular historical character and location to a particular modern nation and/or state, in order to justify the right of that state or nation to that piece of territory or deny other nations the right to this historical “inheritance.” The third type of studies was narrowly focused on source analysis. The field was ripe for a work that would bring together the analysis of Byzantine sources, Turkic and Greek philology, and Byzantine history. The *Byzantinoturcica* by Gyula Moravcsik (1892–1972) became that work.<sup>339</sup>

---

accompanied a letter addressed to Pechenegs: Diaconu, *Les Petchénègues au Bas-Danube*, 55. On Svetsits’kyi, see: Vitalii O. Gavrylenko, “Vizantiyskaya sfragistika v otechestvennoy istoriografii. (Bibliograficheskiy ukazatel’),” *VizVrem* 33 (1972), 245–50.

336 Ferdinand Chalandon, *Essai sur le règne d’Alexis I-er Comnène (1081–1118)* (Paris: A. Picard et fils, 1900); *Idem*, *Les Comnènes. Études sur l’Empire Byzantin au XI et au XII siècles. II. Jean II Comnène (1118–1143) et Manuel I Comnène (1143–1180)* (Paris: A. Picard et fils, 1912).

337 *Ibid.*, 1–20.

338 *Ibid.*, 95–136, 151–4, 173–4, 266–7.

339 About him: György Székely, “In Memoriam Gyula Moravcsik,” *Annales Universitatis Scientiarum Budapestinensis de Rolando Eötvös nominatae. Sectio Historica* 14 (1973), 359–64; János Harmatta, “Byzantium and the Ancient Hungarians: The Life-Work of Gyula Moravcsik,” in *Byzance et ses voisins: Mélanges à la mémoire de Gyula Moravcsik à*



Having received an excellent education (Budapest in 1910–14, Rome in 1911, Paris and Munich in 1913), Moravcsik, under the direction of the linguist Zoltán Gombocz, took up the subject of the prehistory of the Hungarians and their relations with Byzantium.<sup>340</sup> World War I interrupted his research, but Moravcsik used his time as a prisoner of war in Krasnoyarsk and Irkutsk to study Turkish, Russian, and Modern Greek. The fruit of his intensive work in the first post-war decade was the article “Hungarian Bibliography of Turkology and the Hungarians’ Relations with the Orient.”<sup>341</sup>

Due to the lack of full-fledged critical publications of Byzantine sources, Moravcsik, preparing his works in source analysis, was obliged to study Byzantine manuscripts in person in Europe’s largest libraries. In 1934, he published his monumental monograph *The Byzantine Sources for Hungarian History*.<sup>342</sup> In 1942, the book came out in German in a somewhat revised form as *The Byzantine Sources for the History of the Turkic Peoples*.<sup>343</sup> A second volume appeared a year later, focusing on vestiges of Turkic languages in Byzantine sources. From this emerged Moravcsik’s life work, the *Byzantinoturcica*, – even though the general academic public became familiar with it only after the publication of the second edition in Berlin in 1958.<sup>344</sup> Presented by Moravcsik at the 11th International Congress of Byzantine Studies in the same year, it garnered a host of positive responses.<sup>345</sup>

---

*l’occasion du centième anniversaire de sa naissance*, ed. Terézia Olajos (Szeged: Generalia, 1994), 7–10.

340 Ibid., 7.

341 Moravcsik, “Ungarische Bibliographie der Turkologie und der orientalisch-ungarischen Beziehungen. 1914–1925.”

342 Idem, *Magyar történet bizánci forrásai* (Budapest: Magyar történelmi társulat, 1934); Lajos Tamás, “[Review of:] Moravcsik, Gyula, *A magyar történet bizánci forrásai* (“Les Sources byzantines de l’Histoire hongroise”). *A Magyar Történettudomány Kézikönyve* (“Manuel des Sciences historiques hongroises”), vol. I. fasc. 6/b., in-8, 256 p.,” *AECO* (1935) no. 1, 283–4. Throughout his life, Moravcsik continued to translate fragments from Byzantine sources pertaining to Hungarian history. The compendium *Az Árpád-kori magyar történet bizánci forrásai* came out already after his death (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1984). Today’s Hungarian Byzantinologists observe that Moravcsik left out a considerable number of Byzantine sources for nomadic history, including history of the Hungarians: László Balogh, “A New Source on the Hungarian Raids against Byzantium in the Middle of the Tenth Century,” *Chronica* (2008), no. 7–8, 16–7.

343 Gyula Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica I–II* (Budapest: Királyi Magyar Pázmány Péter Tudományegyetemi, Görög Filológiai Intézet, 1942–1943).

344 Idem, *Byzantinoturcica I–II* (Berlin, 1958).

345 Dimitŭr Angelov, “XI vizantoloshki kongres v Myunkhen,” *IstPreg* (1958), no. 6, 127. Moravcsik’s courageous civic stance is worth noting: he refused to attend a “Socialist” conference on Byzantine Studies in Prague (November 2, 1957) a year after the infamous

The *Byzantinoturcica* was a radically new phenomenon in source analysis and criticism, both in Byzantine studies and more generally.<sup>346</sup> The Hungarian Byzantinologist compiled a scholarly reference work that covered the entire range of Byzantine written sources featuring the Turkic peoples.

The first volume of the study consists of two parts. The first includes brief sketches of the origins and history of those Turkic peoples that had relations with Byzantium or were written about by Byzantine authors (the Huns, Avars, Khazars, Bulgars, Magyars, Pechenegs, Uzes, Cumans, Seljuk Turks, and others) and contains a detailed bibliography of works published by 1956 (in the second edition). The second part arranges alphabetically the Byzantine sources featuring these peoples, with page numbers cited from the editions used by Moravcsik (for instance, in the article on Ioannes Zonaras,<sup>347</sup> whose *Lexicon* Moravcsik cites after Tittman's Leipzig edition of 1808, he lists the references to Pechenegs on pages 464, 523–536, 571, and others of that edition<sup>348</sup>). For each source, the scholar provides a full bibliography, the locations and brief descriptions of the known manuscript copies, and a list of editions and translations. This form and scope of presentation (for instance, approximately forty sources for the history of the Pechenegs, Torks, and Cumans are included,<sup>349</sup> while earlier historians working on this topic, such as Vasilievskii or Zlatarski, had used no more than ten) made medievalists' work much easier.

The second volume, *The Linguistic Relics of Turkic Peoples in Byzantine Sources*, is devoted to the search for Turkic words and proper names in Greek texts and to the analysis and attribution of various ethnonyms. Despite its purely philological nature, the volume has value for historians as well.<sup>350</sup>

---

events in Budapest: Zinaida V. Udaltsova, "Konferentsiya vizantinistov v Prage," *VizVrem* 15 (1959), 295.

346 Veselin Beshevliev in *IstPreg* (1958), no. 6, 120–2; Alexandr P. Kazhdan in *VizVrem* 16 (1959), 271–87; Károly Czeglédy in *Acta Antiqua ASH* 8 (1960), no. 3–4, 455–60. The only negative review I have been able to find is an article by Boris Goryanov, who criticized the book and its author as "reactionary": Boris T. Goryanov, "Kriticheskiy obzor zhurnala *Études byzantines* i *REB* za 1943–1948," *VizVrem* 4 (1951), 167.

347 Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, 1, 344–8.

348 *Ibid.*, 347.

349 *Ibid.*, 210, 218, 221, 225, 234, 256–8, 272, 295, 301, 327, 334–41, 344–51, 426–9, 444–51, 467, 501–2, 514, 525, 527–8, 538, 542–3, 557, etc.

350 In his analysis of ethnonyms and Turkisms in Byzantine sources, Moravcsik dispelled quite a few myths and put an end to quite a few academic controversies. A classic example is the word *komenton*, found in Leo the Deacon and Ioannes Skylitzes and referring to a military council (in the first case – in the army of Sviatoslav, and in the second – among the Pechenegs sent by Constantine Monomachos against the Seljuk Turks in Asia Minor). Dozens of hypotheses had been put forward about the origin of the word. It had been traced back to *комоньство*, *кметство*, and *Gemeinde*, and sometimes interpreted as



First formulated by Vasilievskii in “Byzantium and the Pechenegs,” the problem of Byzantine-nomadic relations in the 10th and 11th centuries emerged as a promising research field by the end of the 1950s.

Vasilievskii’s work laid the foundation for the study of Byzantine-Pecheneg relations, outlined the range of pertinent sources, examined an important period in the history of Byzantine-nomadic relations (1048–95), and drew attention to their implications for the history of the empire and Europe more generally.

The totality of the Byzantine, Hungarian, Bulgarian, Western (Latin), Eastern (Armenian, Arabic, Georgian, Syrian), and other written sources provided the evidence base for the study of the subject. From the mid-19th to mid-20th century, most of these texts (including the most important ones – the *DAI*, *Alexiad*, the works of Ioannes Skylitzes and Georgios Kedrenos, various Eastern authors’ reports on the north coast of the Black Sea, and others) were brought to the attention of the scholarly community and published in whole or in part in their original languages or in translations into English, French, German, Russian, and other European languages. Most of the principal sources were subjected to thorough analysis, involving the clarification of their chronology, localization of events, and ethnic identification of the peoples that took part in those events. Numismatic and sigillographic sources began to be widely used in research and argumentation during the last of the three phases into which I have divided this period. Medieval archaeology had its first successes.

Based on written sources, representatives of several national historiographies thoroughly explored the factual aspect of the nomadic presence in their respective lands (those of Ukraine, Russia, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Romania) and the nomads’ relations with the indigenous inhabitants. New interpretations of these relations emerged. Works on various nomads traced their history from their origins to their appearance on the north coast of the Black Sea and further on to their disappearance from the historical arena. Scholars studied the relics of their languages preserved in Byzantine and other texts.

In addition to progress in the publication and in-depth analysis of sources, Byzantine studies made important advances in the understanding of the

---

Romanian. Based on the linguistic survey of an assortment of Greek sources, Moravcsik proved that the word was in fact Byzantine: Gyula Moravcsik, “Komenton – pechenezhs-koye ili russkoye slovo,” in *Studia Byzantina* [G. Moravcsik’s collected works] (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1967), 275–82 [first published in 1951]. On Moravcsik’s contributions to the study of Turkic-Byzantine relations, see also the next chapter.

empire's history in the 10th and 11th centuries and of such matters as military organization and administration, ecclesiastical life, and domestic and foreign affairs. The facts of Byzantium's relations with the nomads of the North Pontic steppes were more or less established.

By the mid-20th century, the summing-up of the existing evidence and search for new, chiefly material sources were the most promising avenues of research. Archaeology, numismatics, and sigillography were picking up steam; seals, coins, and archaeological evidence began to be reimagined as historical sources in their own right, rather than mere museum artifacts.

## “Poised Perception”

### *Trans-Danubian Turks in the Historiography of the Balkan-Danubian Countries*

This contrasts the quickness of seeing with the groping of the blind person. It seems to us, he says, that the blind person lacks vision.... Appelbaum’s argument is that the groping, the halting progress with a stick, also has its privileges. The blind person sees what the person with vision does not, because she moves tentatively. Because instead of making use of direct lines of vision to distant objects, she gropes her way across the terrain. But Appelbaum argues that in the groping there is a kind of poise, what he calls a “poised perception.”

JOHN LAW, *After Method. Mess in Social Science Research*<sup>1</sup>



#### 1 Preconditions

World War II and the post-war partition of the world, the establishment of Communist regimes in most countries of Central and Southeastern Europe, the beginning of the Cold War, and the overall paradigm shifts in the sciences and humanities could not but affect historical scholarship across the world.

The borders of post-war Europe were redrawn, again. The USSR secured Northern Bukovyna, Bessarabia, and most of Carpathian Ruthenia. Transylvania was returned to Romania, and Southern Dobruja – to Bulgaria.<sup>2</sup> Taking advantage of its position as a victor state, the USSR was able to put Communist governments into power in Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria. As these countries were gradually drawn into the foreign-policy orbit of the Soviet

---

1 John Law, *After Method. Mess in Social Science Research* (London/New York: Routledge, 2004), 10.

2 On the history of the dispute between Bulgaria and Romania over Dobruja see: Jean Nouzille, “La frontière bulgare-roumaine en Dobroudja,” *RRH* (1996), no. 1–2, 27–42.

Union, the Marxist doctrine was forced on their academic communities<sup>3</sup> and the influence of the Soviet humanities grew.

Aside from the entrenchment of the Marxist methodology, other common trends in the historical scholarship of Romania, Bulgaria, and Hungary, at least during the first decades of Communist rule, included challenging the authority of the “old school” of historians<sup>4</sup> and seeking points of convergence with the “Eastern Slavs” in the history of these countries, as the contemporary realities were projected into the past. Thus, in Bulgaria campaigns of harassment began (and continued up to the fall of the Berlin Wall) against those historians who wrote on the Turkic element in the ethnogenesis, culture, and history of the Bulgarian people. Among others, the *oeuvre* of Petăr Mutafchiev became a target for attacks, and the scholar himself was declared a “fascist.”<sup>5</sup> In Romanian historiography, the thesis about the common origin of the Slavs and Romanians dominated until the end of the 1950s,<sup>6</sup> though Romanian historians relatively quickly recovered their national stance.<sup>7</sup> Assigning a special “positive role” to the Eastern Slavs, Rus’, and Russia in the history of Hungary was also characteristic of the work of many Hungarian scholars in the post-war

- 
- 3 It has, however, been argued that the Marxist methodology never really took root in archaeological research in the countries of Southeastern Europe: Predrag Novaković, “Archaeology in the New Countries of Southeastern Europe: A Historical Perspective,” in *Comparative Archaeologies. A Sociological View of the Science of the Past*, ed. Ludomir R. Lozny (New York: Springer, 2011), 443. For an alternative view, see Florin Curta, “Marksizm v rabotakh Marii Komsha,” *Stratum Plus* (2020), no. 5, 37.
- 4 Bulgarian Marxist historians “had to overcome the weight of great names ... in historiography”: Petăr Petrov, “Bŭlgarskite istoritsi za sotsialno-ikonomichestkite otnosheniya i klasovite borbi prez srednoviekovieto,” in *Problemi na bŭlgarskata istoriografiya sled Vtorata svetovna voŭna* (Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 1973), 175.
- 5 Idem, “Burzhoazno-idealistichestkite i reaktsionno-fashistkite vŭzgliedi na prof. Petăr Mutafchiev.” In Communist Bulgaria, the Turkish minority suffered discrimination the aim of which was to assimilate them or force them to emigrate. See: Ulrich Büchenschütz, *Maltsinstvenata politika v Bŭlgariya. Politikata na BKP kŭm evrei, romi, pomatsi i turtsi* (Sofia: Mezhdunaroden tsentŭr po problemite na maltsinstvata i kulturnite vzaimodeistviya, 2000). See also: Valeri Stoyanov, “Genesis and Development of the ‘Turkish Question’ in Bulgaria,” *BHR* 23 (1998), no. 1–2, 7–29; Idem, “Ausgrenzung und Integration: Die bulgarischen Türken nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg,” *Österreichische Osthefte* 39 (1997), no. 2, 193–221.
- 6 See: Andrei Măgureanu, “Dezbateri privind etnogeneza românilor în anii ’50. De la manualul lui Roller la Tratatul de Istorie,” *SCIVA* 58 (2007), no. 3–4, 289–321.
- 7 Lucian Boia, *History and Myth in Romanian Consciousness* (Budapest: CEU Press, 2001), 73–6. In Yugoslavia, the return to the “national” (Serbian) positions occurred somewhat later, in the 1970s: Alexei Yu. Timofeyev, *Krest, kinzhal i kniga. Staraya Serbiya v politike Belgrada. 1878–1912* (Saint Petersburg: Aleteyya, 2007), 11.

period, including such medievalists as Emma Léderer, Iván Bertényi,<sup>8</sup> and Antal Bartha.<sup>9</sup>

Research interests also changed. In Bulgarian medieval studies, priority was now given to issues of the social and economic development of the Bulgarian lands and condition of the peasantry; scholars devoted much attention to the study of heretical movements (particularly the Bogomil heresy), which were seen as manifestations of social protest.<sup>10</sup> A new, Marxist periodization of the medieval history of Romania appeared in 1957: the period up to the 10th century became the ancient era (*epoca veche*), and the period from the 11th to 18th centuries began to be called the feudal era (*epoca feudală*).<sup>11</sup> This development not only found reflection in titles of scholarly works, but also shaped directions of subsequent research: many studies of individual historical phenomena ran only up to the 10th century, even if the phenomenon in question continued beyond that point. The Romanian Workers' Party began to set tasks for historians.<sup>12</sup> In Hungary, historical scholarship formally adopted the Marxist position after the so-called “turn” of 1948 (marked by the final nationalization of industry and transition to “the socialist track”).<sup>13</sup>

8 See, for instance, Iván Bertényi, “K voprosu o mezhdunarodnom polozhenii Vengrii posle tatarskogo nashestviya,” *Annales Universitatis Scientiarum Budapestinensis de Rolando Eötvös nominatae. Sectio Historica* 19 (1978), 241–9.

9 Antal Bartha wrote that the Hungarians created a symbiotic social and economic relationship with the Slavs, while the Pechenegs were antagonistic to farmers. He also accentuated the negative role of Germany and the positive role of the Eastern Slavs. See: Antal Bartha, “Vostochnaya Yevropa i ranneye srednevekov'ye Vengrii do serediny XI v.,” *Nouvelles études historiques* (1965), no. 1, 18.

10 Dimitŭr Kosev et al., “Osnovni etapi v razvitiето na bŭlgarskata istoricheska nauka sled Vtorata svetovna voĭna,” in *Problemi na bŭlgarskata istoriografiya sled Vtorata svetovna voĭna*, 23. As Petŭr Petrov observes, socio-economic relations and class struggle in the Middle Ages began to interest Bulgarian historians shortly after 9 September 1944: Petŭr Petrov, “Bŭlgarskite istoritsi,” 175.

11 Andrei Oŭetea, “Problema periodizări istoriei romĭniei,” *SRdI* (1957), no. 6, 106–9. Interestingly, vestiges of this periodization can be seen in Romanian historiography even today. For instance, in the collection published to mark the 80th anniversary of Petre Diaconu, the reader will find separate chapters on “Byzantina” and “Medievalia”: *Prinos lui Petre Diaconu*.

12 “Sarcinile de mare păspundere puse de Congresul al II-lea al P.M.R în fața istoricilor,” *SRdI* (1956), no. 1, 7–14.

13 “K voprosu o polozhenii i zadachakh vengerskoy istoricheskoy nauki. (Materialy diskussiy rasshirenoy redkolegii zhurnala obshchestva vengerskikh istorikov ‘Századok’ (‘Veka’),” *Acta Historica ASH* 3 (1954), no. 1–2, 115–37; Ivan Berend, “Zashchita stabilizatsii i ‘sukhoy’ (gosudarstvenno-kapitalisticheskii) put’ ekspropriatsii kapitala v Vengrii (1946–1947) (Rezyume),” *Századok* (1962), no. 1–2, 147–8. For example, one of Györfŷy’s articles on the Cumans, published in 1953, was entitled “The Feudalization of the Cumans”:

Almost everywhere, organizational changes went hand in hand with methodological ones.<sup>14</sup>

## 2 The Pechenegs and Cumans and Their Relations with Byzantium in Hungarian Historiography, Mid-20th to Early 21st Centuries

The contribution of Hungarian scholars of the second half of the 20th century to the study of Byzantium's relations with nomads of the North Pontic steppe can be defined as the sum of the achievements of Hungarian Oriental and Byzantine studies, medieval studies (in the narrow sense of the exploration of the history of Hungary and its neighbors in the 9th to 11th centuries on the basis of written sources), and archaeology. In Hungarian historiography, all these branches have come to be closely tied together: due to the scarcity of sources on the early history and so-called prehistory of the Hungarians, almost all research in this area is interdisciplinary.<sup>15</sup>

### 2.1 *Hungarian Oriental Studies*

It is generally believed that the founders of Hungarian Turkology, Ármin Vámbéry and Zoltán Gombocz, were unable to establish lasting schools of their own, even though Gombocz's work left a mark on the research interests of Gyula Moravcsik. Another strong influence on Moravcsik's and Károly Czeglédy's interest in early history of the Hungarians was Gyula Németh. Such prominent Hungarian scholars as Lajos Ligeti, István Mándoky Kongur, and István Vásáry can also be considered Németh's students.<sup>16</sup>

---

György Györffy, "A kunok feudalizálódása," in *Tanulmányok a parasztság történetéhez Magyarországon a 14. században*, ed. György Székely (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1953), 248–75. However, in the view of István Zimonyi, the Soviet ("Marxist") influence on Hungarian scholarship became more of a formality after the 1960s and never really touched philology at all: Zimonyi, "The State of the Research on the Prehistory of the Hungarians," 99.

14 Erik Molnár, "Desyatiletnyaya rabota vengerskoy istoricheskoy nauki (Rezyume)," *Századok* (1955), no. 2, 318. Predrag Novaković believes that in the case of Yugoslavia "the 'Soviet' (but not Marxist) influence or tradition existed (and it is still felt today) in the organization of archaeological institutional systems": Novaković, "Archaeology in the New Countries of Southeastern Europe: A Historical Perspective," 443 and 445.

15 The collection *Research on the Prehistory of the Hungarians* and an article by László Révész ("Archäologische Forschungen zur Landnahmezeit in Ungarn: Ergebnisse, methodologische Probleme, ungelöste Fragen," in *Europa im 10. Jahrhundert. Archäologie einer Aufbruchzeit. Internationale Tagung in Vorbereitung der Ausstellung "Otto der Große, Magdeburg und Europa"* (Meinz: Philipp von Zabern, 2002), 123–130) sums up the history of the study of the early Hungarians on the basis of written and archaeological sources.

16 Zimonyi, "The State of the Research on the Prehistory of the Hungarians," 98.



A long-time professor at Loránd Eötvös University (Budapest), Károly Czeplédy (1914–96)<sup>17</sup> authored a number of works touching on the origins and early history of the Khazars, Hungarians, Pechenegs, Cumans, and other nomadic peoples, and generally on the history of the Eurasian steppes in the 6th to 9th centuries.<sup>18</sup> Czeplédy advanced several interpretations and hypotheses, notably on the location and origin of the names of the historical regions of Λεβεδία and Ἀτελκούζου.<sup>19</sup> He also suggested an early dating for the conflicts between the Pechenegs and Hungarians mentioned in the *DAI* and found references to a people by the name of Xangār (Kangarāyē), which

- 
- 17 About him: Edit Bérces, “Egy őstörténet-kutató emlékére. Czeplédy Károly pályaképe (1914–1996),” *Polvax* (1999), no. 3, 79–96.
- 18 Károly Czeplédy, “A magyarság Dél-Oroszországban,” in *A magyarság őstörténete*, 100–22; Idem, “Keleten maradt magyar töredékek,” in *A magyarság őstörténete*, 154–77; Idem, “A IX. századi magyar történelem főbb kérdései,” *Magyar Nyelv* 41 (1945), 33–5; Idem, “A kunok eredetéről,” *Magyar Nyelv* 45 (1949), 43–50; Idem, “Új adat a besenyők történetéhez,” *Magyar Nyelv* 46 (1950), 361–2; Idem, *IV–IX századi nepmozgalmak a steppén* (Budapest, 1954); Idem, “A kangarok (besenyők) a VI. századi szír forrásokban,” *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Nyelv – és Irodalomtudományi Osztályának Közleményei* (1954), no. 5, 243–76; Idem, “Kangarok és zavarok,” *Magyar Nyelv* 52 (1956), 120–5; Idem, “Gardizi on the History of Central Asia (745–780 A.D.),” *Acta Orientalia ASH* 27 (1973), 257–67; Idem, “From East to West: The Age of Nomadic Migrations in Europe,” *AEMAE* 3, 1983, 25–126.
- 19 For historiographical overviews of the problem of these historic regions, see: István Erdélyi, *Őseink nyomában. A magyar őstörténet kutatása a XX. században* (Budapest: Masszi Kiadó, 2004), 47–52 and Gyula Kristó, *Hungarian History in the 9th Century* (Szeged: Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 1996), 155–7. See also: Péter Kiraly, “Óbolgár Forrás a 894–896. Évi Magyar-Bolgár háborúról,” *Századok* (1977), 2, 320–8; Lorand Benkő, “Zur Geschichte der Ungartums vor der Landnahme im Zusammenhang mit Levedia und Eteköz,” *Acta Linguistica ASH* 34 (1984), 153–98; Péter Váczi, “Eteköz – die frühere Heimat der Ungarn,” *Mitteilungen des Archäologischen Instituts der Ungarischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 14 (1985), 169–75; Idem, “The Byzantine Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus and the Saga of the Hungarian Conquest,” *Hungarian Studies* (1988), no. 4, 129–35; László Várady, “Revision des Ungarn-Image von Konstantinos Porphyrogenetos. Textanalysen und Reinterpretation der Aussagen des Konstantinos Porphyrogenetos über die Politikgeschichte der Ungarn,” *BZ* 82 (1989), 22–58; Zoltán Bálint Takács, “A magyar honfoglalás előzményeiről,” *Savaria. A Vas Megyei Múzeumok Értesítője* 27, (2002), 199–211; Idem, “A magyarok türk megnevezése Biborbanszületett Konstantinos ‘De administrando imperio’ című munkájában,” *Savaria. A Vas Megyei Múzeumok Értesítője* 28 (2004), 317–33; Péter Juhász, “Nomád szállásváltások. Besenyők és magyarok,” *Belvedere Meridionale* 28 (2016), no. 4, 83–93; Sándor László Tóth, “Az etelközi magyar törzsek szállásterületei,” in *Kelet és nyugat között. Történeti tanulmányok Kristó Gyula tiszteletére*, ed. László Koszta (Szeged: Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 1995), 471–85; Idem, “Megjegyzések a Levedia-Eteköz problémához,” in *A Kárpát-medence és a steppe*, ed. Alfréd Márton (Budapest: Balassi Kiadó, 2001), 127–36; *A magyar törzsszövetség politikai életrajza (A magyarság a 9-10. században)* [Dissertation] (Szeged, 2014).

can be connected to the Pechenegs, in mid-6th-century Syrian sources.<sup>20</sup> The Hungarian Orientalist of Japanese descent Toru Senga discovered an 8th-century Tibetan text likely describing the Pechenegs before their migration to Europe.<sup>21</sup> István Vásáry wrote on the Cuman language<sup>22</sup> and the origins of the ethnonyms Qun/Quman, Qıpçaq, Qanlı, and Tatar<sup>23</sup> and published a valuable monograph on the history of the military presence of the Cumans and Mongols in the Balkans in the 12th to 14th centuries.<sup>24</sup> An expert on Caucasian languages, Márton Istvánovits drew the attention of the academic community to the Georgian sources for Pecheneg history.<sup>25</sup>

János Harmatta (1917–2004) was primarily interested in pre-Islamic Central Asia, but he also published a few works on the “European” history of the Pechenegs. In his article “Tribes with Many-Colored Horses,” he developed Németh’s ideas concerning the Pecheneg tribal names cited by Constantine Porphyrogenitus and concluded that they were associated with the color names for the cardinal directions used by medieval Turkic peoples.<sup>26</sup> Harmatta also studied the problem of urban settlement among the Pechenegs.<sup>27</sup>

- 
- 20 Károly Czeglédy, “Új adat a besenyők történetéhez.” It is possible that the ethnic name *Kάγγαρ*, used by Constantine Porphyrogenitus, derives from Kängäräs “and the people having piebald horses”: Zimonyi, *Muslim Sources on the Magyars*, 69.
- 21 Toru Senga, “A besenyők a 8. században,” *Századok* 126 (1992), no. 5–6, 503–16. See also: Idem, “Morávia bukása és a honfoglaló magyarok,” *Századok* 117 (1983), no. 2, 307–45.
- 22 István Vásáry, “Oriental Languages of the Codex Cumanicus: Persian and Cuman as Linguae Francae in the Black Sea Region (13th–14th centuries),” in *Il Codice Cumanico e il suo mondo*, eds. Felicitas Schmieder and Peter Schreiner (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 2005), 105–24.
- 23 István Vásáry, “Népnév és néptörténet (kun/kuman, kipcsak, kangli, tatár),” in *A Kárpát-medence és a Steppes*, 186–95.
- 24 Idem, *Cumans and Tatars. Oriental Military in the pre-Ottoman Balkans, 1186–1365* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2005). Unfortunately, the author mentions Byzantium’s relations with the trans-Danubian Turkic nomads before 1185 only in passing (pp. XII, 20–21). It is noticeable that Vásáry tries to “clear” the territory of Transylvania of Cumans, stressing that “Transylvania was an organic part of the Hungarian Kingdom, and it is a mystery why Uspenskij and later Zlatarski had thought that a part of Transylvania belonged to Cumania”: Vásáry, *Cumans and Tatars*, 32.
- 25 Márton Istvánovits, “Adatok a besenyők történetéhez a grúz króniakák alapján,” *Ethnographia* 74, (1963), 106–8; Idem, “Georgian Data Bearing on the Pechenegs,” *Acta Orientalia ASH* 16 (1963), no. 319–23.
- 26 János Harmatta, “Színes lovú népek,” *MNy* 42 (1946), 26–34. (On the connection between colors and cardinal directions among the Turkic nomads, see: Omeljan Pritsak, “Non-‘Wild’ Polovtiansins,” in *To Honor Roman Jakobson: Essays on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, vol. 2 (The Hague/Paris: Mouton, 1967), 1615–23). Another work by Harmatta, based on the *DAI*, is “Konstantinos Porphyrogenetos magyar vonatkozású művei,” in *A honfoglaláskor írott forrásai*, eds. László Kovács and László Veszprémy (Budapest: Balassi Kiadó, 1996), 105–11.
- 27 Robert Benedicti, “Vizantinovedeniye v Vengrii (1946–1959),” *VizVrem* 20 (1961), 305.

Lajos Ligeti (1902–87), who is considered the mentor of most Orientalists working in Hungary today,<sup>28</sup> explored Turkic influences on the language of the Hungarians and continued the Hungarian Orientalist tradition in the study of the *Codex Cumanicus*.<sup>29</sup> Throughout his academic career, the Turkologist László Rásonyi (1899–1984)<sup>30</sup> studied personal names of Turkic origin in Hungarian and worked on problems of Turkic onomastics. He left after his death a large archive, including his “Onomasticon” – a card index numbering more than sixty thousand entries.<sup>31</sup> Rásonyi studied Cuman anthroponyms,<sup>32</sup> published on “Bulaqs and Oguzs in Medieval Transylvania,”<sup>33</sup> and was the first scholar since Rasovskii to turn to the problem of the Oghuzes-Torks’ relations with Hungary and Byzantium.<sup>34</sup> Rásonyi’s views on the history of pre-Ottoman

- 
- 28 András Róna-Tas, “Khazary i mad’yary,” in *Khazary. Yevrei i slavyane*, eds. Vladimir Ya. Petrukhin et al. (Moscow: Mosty kultury, 2005), 121.
- 29 Lajos Ligeti, *A magyar nyelv török kapcsolatai a honfoglalás előtt és az Árpád-korban* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1986), 89–130; 511–9; 538–44; Idem, “Prolegomena to the Codex Cumanicus,” *Acta Orientalia ASH* 35 (1981), no. 1, 1–54. On the influence of Turkic languages on Hungarian, see: András Róna-Tas and Árpád Berta, *West Old Turkic: Turkic Loanwords in Hungarian*, 2 vols (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2011). On vestiges of the Cuman language in Hungary, see also: Tibor Halasi-Kun, “Kipchak Philology and the Turkic Loanwords in Hungarian,” *AEMAE* 1 (1975), 155–210; István Mándoky Kongur, *A kun nyelv magyarországi emlékei* [Ph.D. thesis] (Karcag, 1993); Idem, *Kunok és magyarok* (Budapest: Molnár Kiadó, 2012). György Györffy and Gábor Vörös attempted to locate “Pecheneg” words in the works of Constantine VII and other written sources: György Györffy, “Monuments du lexique Petchénègue,” *Acta Orientalia ASH* 18 (1965), no. 1–2, 73–81; Gábor Vörös, “Relics of the Pecheneg Language in the Works of Constantine,” *The Turks*, 1, 617–31; István Ferenczy, “Barót nevééről s az erdővidéki-barcasági besenyő csoport történeti szerepéről,” *Acta: a Csíki Székely Múzeum és a Székely Nemzeti Múzeum évkönyve* (1996), no. 1, 149. See also: Péter Egy Tóth, “A besenyő betelepülés helynévi emléke,” *Archívum Supplementum ad honorem Béla Kovács dedicatum – A Heves Megyei Levéltár közleményei, különszám* (1993), 247–59.
- 30 About him: Lajos Ligeti, “Le professeur L. Rásonyi,” *Acta Orientalia ASH* 28 (1974), 147–51.
- 31 László Rásonyi and Imre Baski, *Onomasticon Turcicum* (Bloomington: Sinor Research Institute of Inner Asian Studies, 2007).
- 32 László Rásonyi, “Des antroponymes Comans de Hongrie,” *Acta Orientalia ASH* 20 (1967), no. 2, 135–49; Idem, “Kuman özel adları,” *Türk Kültürü Araştırmaları Dergisi* 3–6 (1966–69), 71–144. Imre Baski, a student of Rásonyi’s, is currently working on this topic: Imre Baski, “On the Ethnic Names of the Cumans of Hungary,” in *Kinship in the Altaic World. Proceedings of the 48th PIAC, Moscow 10–15 July, 2005*, eds. Yelena V. Boykova and Rostislav B. Rybakov (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2006), 43–54.
- 33 László Rásonyi, “Bulaqs and Oguzs in Medieval Transylvania,” *Acta Orientalia ASH* 33 (1979), 129–51. Rásonyi believes that the Bulaq people (also Blaci, Blachi etc.), placed by the medieval sources in Transylvania, should not be identified with the Vlachs; rather, it was a remnant of the Turkic tribe of Bulaq, which appeared in Europe partly with the Proto-Bulgarians and partly during the Cuman migration. Victor Spinei disagrees: Spinei, *The Romanians and the Turkic Nomads*, 77–80.
- 34 Rásonyi, “Bulaqs and Oguzs in Medieval Transylvania,” 143–7.

Turks on the Danube<sup>35</sup> and their influence on the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe, especially on Hungary and Romania, were summed up in his book *Bridges across the Danube*.<sup>36</sup>

One of today's leading Hungarian Turkologists is András Róna-Tas, founder of the Department of Altaic Studies in Szeged.<sup>37</sup> The main subject of his interests is Turkic epigraphics;<sup>38</sup> he has also worked on the issue of Turkic influence on the Hungarians during their state-building period.<sup>39</sup> In 1997, Róna-Tas published his fundamental work *The Hungarians and Europe in the Early Middle Ages*,<sup>40</sup> in which, on the basis of written and archaeological sources, he attempted an integrated description of 9th- to 10th-century Central and Eastern Europe in all its ethnic variety.

Róna-Tas inspired the establishment of the Szeged Proto-History Research Group (functions since 1974). The group counts among its members István Zimonyi, an Orientalist who studies and publishes Eastern sources on the early history of the Hungarians and their neighbors. He has also authored works on the early history of the Pechenegs and history of nomads in the Carpathian basin.<sup>41</sup> Szilvia Kovács, another scholar belonging to the Szeged group, defended

- 
- 35 Idem, "Les Turcs non-Islamisés en Occident (Pétchénegues, Ouzes et Qiptchaqs et leurs Rapports avec les Hongrois)," in *History of the Turkic Peoples in the pre-Islamic Period*, ed. Hans Robert Römer (Berlin: Klaus Schwarz, 2000), 303–31. This article was prepared as early as 1970 for the *Philologiae Turcicae fundamenta* and is in large part devoted to the Cumans.
- 36 László Rásonyi, *Hidak a Dunán. A régi török népek a Dunánál* (Budapest: Magvető, 1981).
- 37 Zimonyi, "The State of the Research on the Prehistory of the Hungarians," 98.
- 38 *Epigraphica Bulgarica: a volgai bolgár-török feliratok*, eds. András Róna-Tas and Sándor Fodor (Szeged, 1973); András Róna-Tas, "A Runic Inscription in the Kujbyšev Region," *Acta Orientalia ASH* 30 (1976), 267–71; Robert Göbl and András Róna-Tas, *Die Inschriften des Schatzes von Nagy-Szentmiklós: eine paläographische Dokumentation* (Vienna: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1995).
- 39 András Róna-Tas, "Ethnogenese und Staatsgründung. Die türkische Komponente in der Ethnogenese des Ungartums," *Abhandlungen der Rheinisch-Westfälische Akademie der Wissenschaften* 78 (1988), 107–42.
- 40 Idem, *A honfoglaló magyar nép* (Budapest: Balassi Kiadó, 1997). A new edition in English: Idem, *Hungarians and Europe in the Early Middle Ages: An Introduction to Early Hungarian History* (Budapest: CEU Press, 1999).
- 41 István Zimonyi, "Az eurázsiai steppe nomádjai és szomszédjai," *Acta Historica* 99 (1995), 65–75; Idem, "A besenyők nyugatra vándorlásának okai," *Acta Historica* 106 (1998), 129–44; *Orientalische Berichte über die Völker Osteuropas*, 162–6, 205, 207–9, 215, 221–4, 241–6, 250; Idem, "The Chapter of the Jayhānī-tradition on the Pechenegs," in *The Steppe Lands and the World Beyond Them*, 99–113; Idem, *Muslim Sources on the Magyars*, 67–71; Szilvia Kovács and István Zimonyi, "Besenyők, úzok és kunok a Kárpát-medencében," in *Török nyelvű népek a középkori Magyar Királyságban*, eds. Szilvia Kovács and István Zimonyi (Altajisztikai Tankönyvtár, 6) (Szeged: Innovariant, 2016), 7–34.

a dissertation on “The History of the Cumans before the Mongol Invasion”<sup>42</sup> in 2012 and has published numerous works on the subject. Polgár Szabolcs, professor at the University of Szeged, uses Latin, Byzantine, and Eastern sources to explore Pecheneg-Hungarian relations, trade on the northern coast of the Black Sea, and the place of the Khazars, Hungarians, and Pechenegs in that region’s history.<sup>43</sup> Attila Kovács, who in 2005 defended a doctoral dissertation at the University of Szeged on the history of the Burtas in the pre-Mongol period, has offered an alternative view on the location and status of various Pecheneg tribes across the North Pontic steppes in the 10th century.<sup>44</sup> Attila Katona-Kiss, also from Szeged, works on the early history of the Pechenegs and Oghuzes and their presence in Hungary.<sup>45</sup>

At the cross-section between Oriental studies and other branches of the humanities lies the problem of nomadism, approached through the systematic interdisciplinary study of the history and culture of nomadic societies on different continents. Given the nature of the early history of the Hungarian people and the lands that would become Hungary, this avenue of research could not remain outside the scope of attention of Hungarian historians. An

42 Szilvia Kovács, *A kunok története a mongol hódításig (Doktori értekezés)* (Szeged, 2012). A full chapter of the dissertation was allotted to the Cumans’ relations with Byzantium (Ibid., 175–263). In 2014, the dissertation was published as a book (Budapest: Balassi Kiadó, 2014). See also: Nora Berend “Cuman integration in Hungary,” in *Nomads in the Sedentary World*, 103–27.

43 Szabolcs Polgár, “Kereskedelem a Fekete-tenger északi partvidékén a 9–10. században. A Ćayhānī-féle leírás adatai a magyarok és a De Administrando Imperio értesülései a besenyők kereskedelméről,” in *Heves megyei régészeti közlemények. A népvándorlások kutatóinak kilencedik konferenciája: Eger, 1998. szeptember 18–20*, vol. 2, eds. Tivadar Petercsák and Adél Váradi (Eger: Heves Megyei Múzeumi Szervezet, 2000), 193–206; Idem, “The Identification of K.rh in the Passage of Ibn Rusta,” *Chronica: Annual of the Institute of History University of Szeged* 4 (2004), 15–21; Idem, “Nine Regions of Khazaria,” *AEMAE* 23 (2017), 257–66.

44 Attila Kovács, “A 10. századi besenyő törzsszervezet és szállásterület problémáinak újragondolása,” *Belvedere Meridionale* 23 (2011), no. 4, 34–57. In his view, since the steppes between the Dnieper and Don were better suited for the grazing of cattle and the main trade routes were located to the east of the Dnieper, it was the “eastern,” rather than “western,” tribes that enjoyed higher status in the Pecheneg tribal federation. Hence, the Syroukalpeí (Szurukülbej) tribe was dominant, while the Kangars had a junior status. On page 49 of this article, there is a map of the geographical distribution of the Pecheneg tribes, based on Constantine Porphyrogenitus. Compare with: Györffy, “Sur la question de l’établissement des Petchénègues en Europe.”

45 Attila Katona-Kiss, “Úzok a Képes Krónikában. A nyugati oguz (úz) törzsek és a Magyar királyság a XI. Században,” *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények* 120 (2007), no. 2, 549–76; Idem, “A besenyők és az oguzok vándorlása a VIII. Században,” *Csodaszarvas* 4 (2011), 7–25; Idem, “Besenyő és oguz gyeptüvédk az Árpád-kori Magyarországon,” in *Őrzők, vigyázatok a határra! Határvédelem, határőrizet, határvadászok a középkortól napjainkig*, eds. László Pósa et al. (Budapest: Zrínyi Kiadó, 2017), 238–52.

early student of nomadism in Hungarian historiography was Antal Bartha. In a number of articles<sup>46</sup> and the monograph *Hungarian Society in the 9th and 10th Centuries*,<sup>47</sup> he employed, if not Marxist methodology, then at least a Soviet-style terminology<sup>48</sup> in considering the coexistence of plough farming and nomadic pastoralism in Eastern Europe. He argued that their synthesis yielded significant economic advantages.

In November 1978, on the initiative of the Hungarian Orientalist Ildikó Ecsedy, a joint conference on “Nomad Societies and State Formations” was held by the Committee for Oriental Studies of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and the Kőrösi Csoma Society. Among the participants were scholars working on medieval nomads of the North Pontic steppe – Károly Czeglédy, András Róna-Tas, György Györffy, the Hungarian archaeologists István Erdélyi (1931–2020), István Fodor, Csanád Bálint, and others.<sup>49</sup> In 1995, a modern view of the role of the nomads in the historical process was presented in István Zimonyi’s article “The Nomads of the Eurasian Steppe and Their Neighbors.”<sup>50</sup>

46 Antal Bartha, “Istoricheskiye svyazi vostochnoyevropeyskogo i vnuzriaziatskogo feodalizma (Chast’ I) (Rezyume),” *Századok* (1963) no. 2, 290–1; “(Chast’ II) (Rezyume),” *Századok* (1963), no. 3, 525–26; Idem, “Vostochnaya Yevropa i ranneye srednevekov’ye Vengrii do serediny XI v.”

47 English version: Idem, *Hungarian Society in the 9. and 10. Centuries* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1975); István Fodor, “[Review of:] Bartha A., *A IX–X századi magyar társadalom*. Budapest, 1968,” *SovArkh* (1969), no. 4, 286–9. The book also considers the causes of the Pecheneg-Hungarian conflicts in the North Pontic steppe.

48 Idem, “Vostochnaya Yevropa i ranneye srednevekov’ye Vengrii do serediny XI v.,” 14.

49 Ildikó Ecsedy, “Nomad Societies and State Formations,” *Acta Orientalia ASH* 35 (1981), no. 2–3, 393–6; Eadem, “Nomads in History and Historical Research,” *Acta Orientalia ASH* 35 (1981), no. 2–3, 201–27; Robert Simon, “Symbiosis of Nomad and Sedendaries on the Character of the Middle Eastern Civilizations,” *Acta Orientalia ASH* 35 (1981), no. 2–3, 229–42; Gábor Vékony, “The Role of a March in the Ethnic and Political Changes,” *Acta Orientalia ASH* 33 (1979), no. 3, 301–14. Fodor argued against the prevailing (especially in Soviet historiography) thesis that nomadic pastoralism was a more primitive form of agriculture than farming: István Fodor, *Die große Wanderung der Ungarn vom Ural nach Pannonien* (Budapest: Corvina Kiadó, 1982), 105. Another prominent Hungarian student of nomadism was Katalin (Käthe) Uray-Köhalmi, author of well-known works on the military arts, especially archery, among nomads: Katalin Uray-Köhalmi, “Über die Pfeifenden Pfeile der innerasiatischen Reiternomaden,” *Acta Orientalia ASH* 3 (1953), 45–71; Eadem, *A steppék nomádja lóháton, fegyverben* (Kőrösi Csoma kiskönyvtár, 12) (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1982).

50 István Zimonyi, “Az eurázsiai steppe nomádjai és szomszédjai,” *Acta Historica* 99 (1995), 65–75. See also: Tamás Hoffmann, “A pásztorkodásról és a nomádokról,” *Agrártörténeti Szemle* 38 (1996), 67–122.

## 2.2 *Medieval Studies*

Despite all the political and ideological upheavals, study of the ancient history of the Hungarians on the basis of Byzantine and Latin written sources continued in “socialist” Hungary. Gyula Moravcsik, György Györffy, and Mátyás Gyóni remained in the country (while such medievalists as Fehér Mátyás Jenő and Imre Boba emigrated).

The works of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, especially the *DAI*, serve as one of the main sources for the early history of the Hungarians, Uzes, and Pechenegs, as well as many other peoples of Eastern and Central Europe. In 1949, Gyula Moravcsik and Romilly James Heald Jenkins published a critical edition of the *DAI* accompanied by an English translation, which they had prepared during World War II.<sup>51</sup> The subsequent Moravcsik-Jenkins’ edition of 1967, revised and enlarged,<sup>52</sup> is still considered the best of its kind.<sup>53</sup>

In 1953, Moravcsik came out with a short monograph *Byzantium and the Magyars*<sup>54</sup> – a kind of summary report on his study of the subject, in which he repeatedly brought up the Pechenegs as intermediaries and an independent factor in Hungaro-Byzantine relations.<sup>55</sup> In his *Einführung in die Byzantinologie* – a textbook of sorts – Moravcsik mentioned the settling of Pechenegs by the Byzantine government in Macedonia.<sup>56</sup>

One of Moravcsik’s research interests was the role of Christianity in the lives of the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe.<sup>57</sup> In his paper “The Byzantine Mission among the Turkic Peoples of the North Coast of the Black Sea,”<sup>58</sup> the

51 Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Administrando Imperio*, Greek text ed. Gyula Moravcsik, English transl. Romilly J.H. Jenkins (Budapest: Pázmány Péter Tudományegyetemi Görög Filológiai Intézet, 1949). Reviews: Peter Charanis in *Speculum* 26 (1951), 380–2; Ivan Dujčev in *BZ* 46 (1953), 119–23. A Hungarian translation came out a year later: Konstantin Biborban, *A birodalom kormányzása*, ed. and transl. Gyula Moravcsik (Budapest: Közoktatásügyi Kiadóvállalat, 1950). In 1962, a second volume appeared, featuring scholarly commentary by Jenkins, Moravcsik, Runciman, Dvornik, Obolensky, Lewis, Leib: Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Administrando Imperio*, vol. 2, *Commentary*, ed. Romilly J.H. Jenkins (London: Athlone Press, 1962).

52 Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Administrando Imperio* (CFHB, 1).

53 Günter Prinzing, “[Review of:] *Die Byzantiner und ihre Nachbarn. Die De Administrando Imperio genannte Lehrschrift des Kaiseros Konstantinos Porphyrogennetos für seinen Sohn Romanos.* / Übersetzt, eingeleitet und erklärt von Klaus Belke und Peter Soustal. Wien: Fassbaender, 1995. 358 S.,” *BZ* 91 (1998), 104–6.

54 Gyula Moravcsik, *Bizánc és a magyarság* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1953). An English translation came out in 1970: Idem, *Byzantium and the Magyars* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1970).

55 *Ibid.*, 63–9.

56 Idem, *Einführung in die Byzantinologie* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1976), 59.

57 Harmatta, “Byzantium and the Ancient Hungarians: The Life-Work of Gyula Moravcsik,” 9.

58 Gyula Moravcsik, “Byzantinische Mission im Kreise der Türkvolker an der Nordküste des Schwarzen Meers,” in *The Proceedings of the XIIIth International Congress*, 15–28.

Hungarian Byzantinologist set out to sum up all known instances of Byzantine proselytizing activity among various Turkic peoples of the North Pontic steppe from the 4th to the 11th century and outline its methods and objectives. He also considered the Byzantine attempt to baptize the Pechenegs Kegen and Tyrach.<sup>59</sup>

A unique one-man team of a Byzantinologist, Turkologist, and classical philologist, Moravcsik revolutionized Turko-Byzantine studies. Among his achievements in this field, a few deserve special mention here: the new edition of the *DAI*, based on the examination of numerous copies and variants; his comprehensive assessment and study of the corpus of Byzantine sources for the field; and his analysis of a number of individual historical events. Moravcsik once again drew the attention of the global scholarly community to the part played in the history of Byzantium and Europe by the northern (relative to the Black Sea) Turkic peoples – the branch that had always received much less consideration in historiography than the southern Turks (the Seljuks and Ottoman Turks).

The Hungarian philologist István Kapitánffy (1932–97) was a student of Moravcsik's who continued his mentor's work. Despite his large scholarly output, he defended his Candidate's thesis, "Hungarobyzantina: Byzantium and the Greeks in Medieval Hungarian Sources," only in 1992. Hungaro-Pecheneg-Byzantine relations are considered in the chapter on "Political Relations at the Turn of the 12th Century" of his dissertation and in the article "The Sources of Constantine's Testimony on the Hungarians."<sup>60</sup>

While the chief area of György Györffy's<sup>61</sup> (1917–2000) research was the prehistory, early history, and historical geography of Hungary, even after the publication of his book *Besenyők és magyarok* (Pechenegs and Magyars) the scholar continued to show interest in non-Hungarian nomads. He authored works on the etymological and semantic aspects of the relics of the Cuman and Pecheneg languages found in written sources<sup>62</sup> and on the integration of the remnants of these peoples into Hungarian society.<sup>63</sup> Györffy also explored

59 Ibid., 25–6.

60 His dissertation and other important works were published together as a book in 2003: István Kapitánffy, *Hungarobyzantina. Bizánc és a görögök a középkori magyarországi forrásokban* (Budapest: Typotex, 2003), 55–80, 139–44.

61 About him: Lajos Kiss, "Györffy György halálára," *Magyar Nyelv* (2001), no. 2, 250–2.

62 György Györffy, "A kun és komán népnév eredetéhez," *Antiquitas Hungarica* 2 (1948), 158–76; Idem, "ΚΑΡΜΠΛΑΟΥΚ," *Acta Antiqua ASH* 10 (1962), no. 4, 413–5; Idem, "Monuments du lexique Petchénègue." Györffy thought that the names "Qun" (Kun) and "Cuman" did not denote the same ethnic group.

63 Idem, "A kunok feudalizálódása"; Idem, "Maagyarország népessége a honfoglalától a XVI. század közepéig," in *Magyaarország történeti demográfiaja*, ed. József Kovacsics (Budapest: Közgazdasági és Jogi Könyvkiadó, 1963), 45–53.



important episodes in the Hungaro-Pecheneg relations of the late 9th century and considered the composition of the Pecheneg tribes, the locations of Pecheneg settlements, and the time of their appearance in Hungary and Europe in general (here he disputed the chronology of Pecheneg-Byzantine relations based on Regino of Prüm's *Chronicon*).<sup>64</sup> Describing the geographical situation of these nomads, Györfly attempted to superimpose the routes of the Mongol khans' migrations between the Dnieper and the Urals as reported by William of Rubruck and John of Plano Carpini onto the realities of the North Pontic steppes and the Lower Danube in the 9th and 10th centuries. In his view, the winter quarters of the khans of the Pecheneg tribes mentioned by Constantine Porphyrogenitus were located in the lower reaches of the rivers Jiu, Olt, Vedeia, Argeş, Ialomiţa, Siret, Prut, Dniester, Southern Buh, Dnieper, Siverskyi Donets, and Don, while the summer quarters were found higher upstream, limited by the forest line. He further applied this view of the distribution of nomadic chieftains' winter and summer quarters to the Hungarian tribes, devoting to this problem a lengthy article “On the System of Residence of the Hungarians, Conquerors of the Fatherland,” published in 1975.<sup>65</sup> A broad picture of the history of the Hungarians in their relations with their neighbors from the late 9th to the mid-10th century was outlined in Györfly's 1985 article “The Hungarians' Land Conquest, Settlement, and Campaigns.”<sup>66</sup> In the same work, the scholar was among the first in Hungarian historiography to broach the subject of the influence of climate on nomadic migrations in the 9th- to 11th-century Eastern European steppes.<sup>67</sup>

64 Idem, “A besenyők Európai honfoglalásának kérdéséhez,” *Történelmi Szemle. A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Történettudományi Intézetének Értesítője* 14 (1971), no. 3–4, 281–8 (a French-language version: “Sur la question de l'établissement des Petchénègues en Europe”); Idem, “Landnahme, Ansiedlung und Streifzüge der Ungarn,” *Acta Historica ASH* 31 (1985), no. 3–4, 231–70; Idem, *A magyarság keleti elemei* (Budapest: Gondolat, 1990), 100, 158–60. See also Györfly's *magnum opus* on the historical geography of Hungary: *Az Árpád-kori Magyarország történeti földrajza. Geographia historica Hungariae tempore stirpis Arpadianae*, 4 vols (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1963–1998).

65 Idem, “A honfoglaló magyarok települési rendjéről,” *AÉ* (1975), no. 2, 191–242. A French version: “Système des residences d'hiver et d'été chez les nomads et les chefs hongrois du Xe siècle,” *AEMAE* 1 (1975), 45–154.

66 Idem, “Landnahme, Ansiedlung und Streifzüge der Ungarn.”

67 *Ibid.*, 236. He later took up this problem again in another piece, “The Carpathian Basin and Etelköz a Thousand Years Ago”: György Györfly and Bálint Zólyomi, “A Kárpát-medence és Etelköz képe egy évezred előtt,” *Magyar tudomány: a Magyar Tudományos Akadémia értesítője* 41 (1996), 899–918. In this incorporation of elements of theory of nomadism and environmental and geographical factors into the study of medieval nomadic history we can detect the influence of Lev Gumilyov – particularly of his article that came out in Budapest's *Acta Archaeologica ASH*: Lev N. Gumilyov, “New Data on the History of the Khazars,” *Acta Archaeologica ASH* 19 (1967), no. 1–2, 61–103. In 1969, Gumilyov and

A number of scholars in today's Hungary – such as Ferenc Makk,<sup>68</sup> Márton Tőser,<sup>69</sup> Szilvia Kovács,<sup>70</sup> and Attila Kovács<sup>71</sup> – have shown interest in

the Hungarian historian István Erdélyi published a review of Svetlana Pletnyova's book *From Camps to Towns: Lev N. Gumilyov and István Erdélyi, "Yedinstvo i raznoobraznye stepnoy kul'tury Yevrazii v sredniye veka," Narody Azii i Afriki* (1969), no. 3, 78–87. In 1959, István Erdélyi defended in Leningrad a dissertation on "Hungarians in Lebedia: Material Culture of the Hungarians in the 9th and 10th Centuries." He subsequently worked closely with Soviet scholars, especially Gumilyov. In the mid-1980s, the Hungarian archaeologists Eugénia Szimonova and István Erdélyi spent several years studying the collections of the Institute of Archaeology at the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, and Ukrainian scholars worked in Hungarian collections. The outcome of this cooperation was the joint publication *Materialy I tys. n.e. po arkeologii i istorii Ukraïny i Vengrii*, ed. Oleg M. Pryhodniuk (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1996).

- 68 Ferenc Makk, *The Árpáds and the Comneni* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1989), 9–11, 29, 47; Idem, "On the Foreign Policy of Saint Stephen," in *Saint Stephen and his Country. A Newborn Kingdom in Central Europe: Hungary*, ed. Attila Zsoldos (Budapest: Lucidus Kiadó, 2001), 37–48; Idem, "Saint Ladislav et les Balkans," *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis de Attila József nominatae. Opuscula Byzantina* 9 (1994), 59–67; Idem, *Ungarische Außenpolitik (896–1196)* (Herna: Tibor Schäfer Verlag, 1999), 64, 84 ; Idem, "[Review of:] Rajmund Kerbl, *Byzantinische Prinzessinnen in Ungarn zwischen 1050–1200 und ihr Einfluss auf das Arpadenkönigreich*. Wien, 1979. 158 + XLIV s.," *Acta Historica ASH* 28 (1982), no. 1–4, 157–9. After Ignác Acsády (Ignác Acsády, *A magyar birodalom története* (Budapest: Athenaeum Irodalmi és Nyomdai Részvénytársaság, 1903), 13), it was generally believed in Hungarian historiography that, as a result of the joint invasion of Hungary by Byzantine and Cuman troops and their defeat at Orşova (1091–92), László I occupied the entire province of Moesia. In Makk's view, only the region between the Morava and Drina was seized, as well as a portion of the lands south of the river Sava and Lower Danube with the fortresses of Sirmium and Belgrade: Makk, "Saint Ladislav et les Balkans," 66. For an overview of the historiography of this question, see Szilvia Kovács, "A kunok története a mongol hódításig," 245–51.
- 69 Márton Tőser, "Kétfrontos harc: Bizánc és a besenyő és szeldzsuk támadások a XI. század közepén," *Hadtörténelmi közlemények* (2015), no. 1, 120–45.
- 70 Szilvia Kovács, "The Cuman Campaigns in 1091," *Golden Horde Review* 1(3), 2014, 174–89. Hungarian version: "A kunok és az 1091-es lebuionai csata," in "*Kun-kép*." *A magyarországi kunok hagyatéka Tanulmányok Horváth Ferenc 60. születésnapja tiszteletére*, ed. Szabolcs Rosta (Kiskunfélegyháza, 2009), 273–87. In this article, the author attempted to answer such questions as who invited the Cumans to Byzantium in 1091, what was their role in the Byzantine victory over the Pechenegs, and whether these Cumans were the same as those that had attacked Hungary the previous year. Szilvia Kovács and István Zimonyi made an overview of Hungaro-nomadic relations in the 10th to 14th centuries: Szilvia Kovács and István Zimonyi, "Kochevniki i Vengry v X–XIV vv.," in *Tyurkskiye kochevniki v Azii i Yevrope*, 146–68.
- 71 In interpreting the events of 1071–72 in the Danube-Sava-Drava region that resulted in the occupation of parts of the Byzantine territory and a siege of Belgrade, Hungarian historians, including Makk, have generally followed the testimony of the *Chronica Hungarorum* on the causes of the conflict. Attila Kovács in his article "1071: Pechenegs, Magyars, Byzantines" surmises that the culprits in the raid on the Hungarian lands that led to a clash between Hungary and Byzantium were not the Pechenegs in Byzantine

Byzantium’s dealings with the Pechenegs and Cumans and in the part played by the Hungarians in these relations. Pecheneg-Hungarian relations have been studied by Gyula Kristó (1939–2004),<sup>72</sup> József Gerics,<sup>73</sup> László Balogh,<sup>74</sup> and János B. Szabó.<sup>75</sup> László Szegfű, Gábor Bagi, and János Bollók have taken up the subject of the settling of the Pechenegs of Khan Thonuzoba in Hungary during the rule of Prince Taksony (943–972).<sup>76</sup> Despite the fact that the role of Pechenegs and other non-Hungarian nomads as auxiliary forces in the service of the Hungarian crown was explored quite comprehensively by Hansgerd Göckenjan,<sup>77</sup> Hungarian medievalists continue to return to this issue.<sup>78</sup> Nora

---

service, but rather their “relatives” from the North Pontic steppe, who were fleeing from the Cuman threat. Attila Kovács, “1071: besenyők, magyarok, bizánciak,” *Acta Historica*, 139 (2017), 45–53. Silviu Oța believes that they were not residents of Banat: Silviu Oța, “Populații nomade de stepă din Banat (secolele XI–XIV). Pecenegii și cumanii,” in *Prinos lui Petre Diaconu*, 494.

- 72 Gyula Kristó, *Az Árpád-kor háborúi* (Budapest: Zrínyi Katonai Könyv- és Lapkiadó, 1986), 55, 63, 68–9. Kristó gives a lot of attention to Pecheneg-Hungarian relations, especially in his monograph *Hungarian History in the Ninth Century* (Szeged: Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 1996), 106–203. The presence of Pechenegs and Cumans, as well as Kabars, Slavs, and others in medieval Hungary is the subject of his book *Nichtungarische Völker im mittelalterlichen Ungarn* (Herne: Tibor Schäfer Verlag, 2008) and a number of articles, such as Idem, “Sírhelyekre vonatkozó adatok korai okleveleinkben,” *Acta Historica* 71, 1981, 21–8.
- 73 József Gerics, “Quaedam puella de genere Tatun. Philologisches und Rechtsgeschichtliches zur Untersuchung einer Chronikenstelle,” *Annales Universitatis Scientiarum Budapestinensis* 9 (1967), 3–30; Idem, “Textbezüge zwischen den ungarischen Chroniken und der Sankt-Ladislaus-Legende,” *Acta Historica ASH* 19 (1973), no. 3–4, 273–303.
- 74 László Balogh, “A New Source on the Hungarian Raids against Byzantium in the Middle of the Tenth Century.” See also his article on the beliefs and religion of the Pechenegs: Idem, “A besenyők hitvilága és a világvallások,” in *Tértítés – megtérés. A világvallások terjedése Kelet-Európa népei között*, eds. László Balogh and Szilvia Kovács (Magyar Östörténeti Könyvtár, 25) (Budapest: Balassi Kiadó, 2009), 93–108. On Bruno of Querfurt’s effort to convert the Pechenegs, see: György Galamb, “Megjegyzések Querfurti Brúnó besenyők közötti térítési kísérletéhez,” in *A Kárpát-medence és a steppe*, 181–5.
- 75 János B. Szabó, “Magrebiták, Úzok – ‘Kunok’, Berendek és Besenyők. Egy XII. századi keleti betelepülés nyomában,” *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények* 129 (2016), no. 1, 148–59.
- 76 László Szegfű, “Megjegyzések Thonuzoba históriájához,” *Századok* (1982), no. 5, 1060–78; János Bollók, “A Thonuzoba-legenda Történelmi Hitele,” *Századok* (1979), no. 1, 97–107; Idem, “L’authenticité historique de la légende de Thonuzoba,” *Annales Universitatis Scientiarum Budapestinensis de Rolando Eötvös Nominatae. Sectio linguistica* 11 (1980), 31–42; Idem, “Meg egyszer Thonuzobáról,” *Századok* (1982), no. 5, 1078–190; Gábor Bagi, “A Thonuzoba-féle besenyő betelepülés,” *Jászkunság* 39 (1993), 26–9.
- 77 Hansgerd Göckenjan, *Hilfsvölker und Grenzwächter im mittelalterlichen Ungarn* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1972).
- 78 Zoltán Kordé, “A magyarországi besenyők az Árpád-korban,” *Acta Historica* 90 (1990), 3–21; Idem, “Kabars, Sicules et Petchenégues: les Hongrois et les auxiliaires militaires,” in *Les Hongrois et l’Europe: conquête et intégration*, eds. Sándor Csernus and Klára Korompay

Berend has published on the problem of the integration of non-Hungarian peoples into medieval Hungarian society.<sup>79</sup>

### 2.3 *Archaeology*

The lands of today's Hungary (unlike those of Romania, Bulgaria, North Macedonia, and parts of Serbia<sup>80</sup>) lay outside the area of active contacts between nomads and Byzantium in the 10th and 11th centuries. Furthermore, Hungarian archaeologists are generally skeptical about the possibility of finding in the Carpathian Basin traces of non-Hungarian nomadic material culture from that period.<sup>81</sup> There may also be a political dimension to this question. On the one hand, Hungarian scholars believe that Hungarian topics were discriminated against in the USSR<sup>82</sup> and that Romanian researchers have been

- 
- (Paris-Szeged: Institut Hongrois de Paris, 1999), 231–9; Gábor Hatházi, “Az Árpád-kori magyar hadszervezet nomád elemeinek kérdéséhez: A besenyők,” *Hadtörténeti Közlemények* 103 (1990), no. 2, 22–60; István Herényi, “A kabarok, székelyek és besenyők szerepe a nyugati végek védelmében és benépesítésében,” *Forrás* 24 (1992), no. 8, 68–76; András Pálóczi-Horváth, “Pogányokkal védelmeztetjük országunkat’: keleti népek a középkori Magyar Királyságban a kálizoktól a kunokig,” *Studia Caroliniensia* 5 (2004), no. 2, 10–30.
- 79 Berend, “Cuman Integration in Hungary”; Eadem, *At the Gate of Christendom: Jews, Muslims, and “Pagans,” in Medieval Hungary, c. 1000-c. 1300* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
- 80 Gordana Marjanović-Vujović, “Archaeological Proving the Presence of the Pechenegs in Beograd Town,” *Balkanoslavica* 3 (1974), 183–8; Vesna Bikić, *Srednjovekovna keramika Beograda* (Belgrade: CICERO, 1994), 131.
- 81 This even included the material record of those nomads who used to be considered “not of Ugor-Magyar origin”: Attila Türk, “Towards a Classification of Grave Types and Burial Rites in the 10th–11th Century Carpathian Basin. Some Remarks and Observations,” in *Avars, Bulgars and Magyars*, 137. Hungarian archaeologists have previously cited the “insufficient state of knowledge” on, for instance, the cemeteries in the Fejér and Tolna regions: *Arkheologiya Vengrii. Konets II tysyacheletiya do n.e. – I tysyacheletye n.e.*, eds. Valerii S. Titov and István Erdélyi (Moscow: Nauka, 1986), 336. The question of the early (10th to 11th centuries) presence of Pechenegs in Banat remains subject to debate: Silviu Oța, *The Mortuary Archaeology of the Medieval Banat (10th–14th Centuries)* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2014), 21. In the words of Péter Langó, “Nowadays, the identification of an assemblage or a grave with a specific ethnic group is rarer”: Péter Langó, “Archaeological Research on the Conquering Hungarians: A Review,” 178. A general overview of Pecheneg and Cuman archaeology in Hungary was recently put together by Ferenc Horváth and Gábor Hatházi: Ferenc Horváth and Gábor Hatházi, “Pechenegi i kuny. Arkheologicheskoye nasledie,” in *Tyurkskiye kochevniki v Azii i Yevrope*, 7–87.
- 82 Langó, “Archaeological Research on the Conquering Hungarians: A review,” 240. For a different view, see: Oleksiï V. Komar, “Drevniye mađyary Etel’keza: perspektivy issledovaniy,” *ADIU* (2011), no. 7, 42. In a 1984 article, Erdélyi observes that, since the burial rituals of the ancient Magyars and Pechenegs bear close resemblance to each other in many

deliberately representing Hungarian burials in Transylvania as Pecheneg or Cuman.<sup>83</sup> But the opposite is also possible – that material remains of non-Hungarian nomads have been treated as Hungarian.<sup>84</sup>

This point may be illustrated by the debates around the “ethnic” attribution of the clay kettles frequently found across the territory of Hungary, the former Yugoslavia, Romania, Bulgaria, Moldova, and Ukraine,<sup>85</sup> or by Zsolt Petkes’s

---

particulars, we can surmise that some of the burials that are considered Pecheneg actually belong to the Magyars: István Erdélyi, “Vengry na Donu,” in *Mayatskoye gorodishche. Trudy sovetsko-bolgarsko-vengerskoy ekspeditsii*, ed. Svetlana A. Pletnyova (Moscow: Nauka, 1984), 23; Horváth and Hatházi, “Pechenegi i kuny. Arkheologicheskoye naslediyе,” 18.

83 Erdélyi, “Vengry na Donu,” 242.

84 For instance, Madgearu in his response to Róna-Tas’s monograph pointed to the controversy surrounding the interpretation of a number of nomadic burials in eastern and southern Romania, which may be Pecheneg but are unequivocally treated as Hungarian in Hungarian historiography: Alexandru Madgearu, “[Review of:] Róna-Tas, András, *Hungarians and Europe in the Early Middle Ages: An Introduction to Early Hungarian History*. New York: Central European University Press, 1999,” in *The Medieval Review* 00.07.06. Available at <https://scholarworks.iu.edu/journals/index.php/%20tmr/article/view/14950/21068#NT5>. Accessed on 9 March 2007. Erwin Gáll casts doubt on the “Hungarian” theory of the provenance of the nomadic burials of the 10th and 11th centuries in Moldova: Erwin Gáll, “The Archaeological Research State of the 9/10–11th Centuries in Moldova (Romania). Some Thoughts on Funerary Places and Stray Finds (Axes),” *Ziridava. Studia Archaeologica* 29 (2015), 313–32. Igor Prokhnenko does not see the nomadic antiquities of the upper Tisza region dating to the 10th century as Hungarian; accordingly, he rejects the idea that the Magyars of Álmos crossed the Verecke Pass: Igor A. Prokhnenko, “Pogrebeniya kochevnikov X veka na territorii Zakarpatskoy oblasti Ukrainy: problema plemennoy atributsii,” *Arkheologiya yevraziyskikh stepey* 6 (2018), 171–80.

85 Kettles were one of the most important objects of nomadic material culture. They could be used not only for cooking meat, but also for evaporating salt, making alcoholic beverages, and other essential tasks: Olexandra V. Romashko, *Metalevi kazany skifs’koyi kul’tury (VII–III st. do n.e.)* [Candidate’s thesis] (Kyiv, 2015), 11. Petre Diaconu, Alojz Habovštiak, Lyudmila Doncheva-Petkova, Gordana Marjanović-Vujović, Dimităr Dimitrov, Georgii Chebotarenko, Gheorghe Postică, and a number of other archaeologists considered cauldron-like clay kettles as markers of Pecheneg presence: Petre Diaconu, “K voprosu o glinyanykh kotlakh na territorii RNR,” *Dacia* 8 (1964), 249–64; Alojz Habovštiak, “Príspevok k poznaniu našej nižinnej dediny v XI–XIII. storoči,” *Slovenská Archeológia* 9 (1961), no. 1–2, 477; Lyudmila Doncheva-Petkova, “Srednovkovni glineni súdove s vútreshni ushi,” *Arkheologiya* (1974), no. 4, 37; Dimităr Dimitrov, “Nomadska keramika v Severoiztochna Bŭlgariya,” *INMV* 11, (1975), 49–57; Marjanović-Vujović, “Archaeological Proving the Presence of the Pechenegs in Beograd Town,” 183; Georgii F. Chebotarenko, “Issledovaniya na rannesrednevekovom poselenii Moleshty I,” in *Arkheologicheskoye issledovaniya v Moldavii v 1985 g.*, ed. Nikolai A. Cetraru (Kishinev: Shtiintsa, 1990), 237–8; Gheorghe Postică, “Glinyanye kotly na territorii Moldavii v rannesrednevekovy period,” *SovArkh* (1985). István Fodor and Anna Moskalenko (under the influence of Hungarian historiography) attributed them to the Hungarians: István Fodor, “Czerépüstjeink származása,”

recent attempt to dispute the idea that horse bits with rigid mouthpieces belong exclusively to Pecheneg burials.<sup>86</sup> Péter Langó and Attila Türk call for a more detailed study of metal personal ornaments traditionally linked with the Pechenegs; they stress the connections between the metallurgy of the Carpathian Basin and Lower Danube (hinting at the Hungarian origin of the artifacts?).<sup>87</sup>

In his 1965 overview of the accomplishments of Hungarian medieval archaeology in the study of nomads in the Hungarian lands to date, Erdélyi noted that scholars were unable to distinguish between burials left by the Hungarian tribes and those of other peoples of that era, first and foremost the Pechenegs; more progress had been made with Cuman burials.<sup>88</sup> Györfly later also observed

---

*AÉ* (1975), no. 2, 264; Anna N. Moskalenko, "Slavyano-venegerskiye otnosheniya v IX v. i drevnerusskoye naseleniye srednego i verkhnego Dona," in *Problemy arkheologii i drevney istorii ugrov*, eds. Alekseĭ P. Smirnov et al. (Moscow: Nauka, 1972), 194. Miklós Takács notes that these kettles occur as early as the late Avar period: Miklós Takács, *Die arpadenzeitlichen Tonkessel im Karpatenbecken* (Budapest: Institut für Archäologie der Ungarischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1986), 88–92. It has also been argued that they can be associated with the late nomads in general, or with both the Hungarians and Pechenegs (Csanád Bálint, "Über einige Tonkessel aus der Umgebung von Sarkel," in *Die Keramik der Saltovo-Majaki*, 16 and 20). Ferenc Horváth and Gábor Hatházi write that this type of pottery was wide-spread in the Saltovo-Mayaki culture and was eventually adopted by the Danubian Bulgars and Hungarians (Horváth and Hatházi, "Pechenegi i kuny. Arkheologicheskoye naslediyе," 18). Szabina Merva does not even mention the "Pecheneg" version in her description of a clay kettle found at Lébény-Billedomb (illustration on p. 249, plate 5, type 6): Szabina Merva, "The 10–11th Century Pottery in the Carpathian Basin and Its Eastern Relations," in *Vtoroy mezhdunarodnyy Mad'yarskiy simpozium*, eds. Sergeĭ G. Botalov et al. (Chelyabinsk: Rifev, 2013), 243–54. Florin Curta believes in "clay kettles in Bulgaria (and the regions north of the river Danube) having a local, and not 'eastern' or 'nomadic' origin" (Florin Curta, "The Image and Archaeology of the Pechenegs," *Banatica* 23 (2013), 161). Mănuclu-Adameşteanu agrees that the question of the clay kettles as a Pecheneg marker is a complicated one, but rejects the idea that the Pechenegs had nothing to do with the spread of this type of vessels in Dobruja in the first half of the 11th century: Gheorge Mănuclu-Adameşteanu, "Nashestviya pechenegov na Nizhnem Dunaye (1027–1048 gg.)," *Stratum plus* (2000), no. 6, 352.

86 Zsolt Petkes, "Rúdablák a 10–12. századi Kárpát-medencében," *Hadak útján XIX. Győr-Moson-Sopron Megyei Múzeumok Igazgatósága Tanulmányok* 3(2012), 231–46.

87 Péter Langó and Attila Türk, " Régészeti adatok a Kárpát-medence 10–11. századi hagyatékanak bulgáriaikapsolatrendszeréhez I. A csüngős veretek," *A Móra Ferenc Múzeum Évkönyve: Studia Archaeologica* 12 (2011), 523; Attila Türk, "A szaltovói kultúrkör és a magyar őstörténet régészeti kutatása," in *Középkortörténeti tanulmányok 6. A VI. Medievisztikai PhD-konferencia (Szeged, 2009. június 4–5.) előadásai*, eds. Péter Tóth and Pál Szabó (Szeged: Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 2010), 262–306.

88 István Erdélyi, "Résultats des recherches archéologiques relatives aux trouvailles des cavaliers nomads orientaux en Hongrie (1953–1964)," *Acta Orientalia ASH* 18 (1965), no. 3, 377.

(despite being familiar with the work of Pletnyova and Fyodorov-Davydov)<sup>89</sup> that there were no clear criteria for identifying Pecheneg burials among all others.<sup>90</sup> Csanád Bálint, influenced by the typology of nomadic burials developed by Svetlana Pletnyova, proposed to interpret as Pecheneg those burials in Hungary that contained skin-effigies of horses,<sup>91</sup> but this idea found no support in Hungarian historiography.<sup>92</sup> In the 1960s, Alán Kralovánszky attributed to the Pechenegs some of the burials in the Sárvíz valley (an interesting feature of these burials was the placing of totem animals in graves),<sup>93</sup> but in 1985 he retracted his suggestion and advocated their Hungarian origin.<sup>94</sup> As of the mid-1980s, several burial grounds in the vicinity of Lake Fertő, as well as in the areas of Fejér and Tolna (between Lake Balaton and the Danube) were considered Pecheneg.<sup>95</sup>

In 1996, to mark another anniversary of the *honfoglaló*, an illustrated catalog of archaeological finds relating to medieval non-Hungarian nomads in Hungary was published, summarizing the results of many years' excavations. Special articles were devoted to the Pechenegs, Cumans, and Alans (Jászok).<sup>96</sup>

89 Hungarian scholars closely watched the progress of Soviet “nomadic” archaeology. Thus, two years after the publication of Svetlana Pletnyova’s article “The Pechenegs, Torks, and Cumans in the South-Russian Steppes (Based the Results of the Volga-Don Archaeological Expedition),” a Hungarian translation of it began to appear in Budapest (Svetlana A. Pletnyova, “Besenyők, torkok és polovcek a déloroszországi steppéken,” *Szovjet Régészet* 16 (1960), 101–62). Earlier still, Artamonov’s article “The Khazar Fortress of Sarkel” was published in Hungary, but in Russian (Mikhail I. Artamonov, “Khazarskaya krepost’ Sarkel,” *Acta Archaeologica ASH* 7 (1956), no. 1, 321–41). A chapter from Artamonov’s book *The History of the Khazars* – “The Magyars and the Pechenegs” – was reprinted in Budapest a year after its publication in Leningrad.

90 Györffy, “Sur la question de l’établissement des Petchénègues en Europe,” 28.

91 Csanád Bálint, “A honfoglalás kori lovastemetkezések néhány,” *A Móra Ferenc Múzeum Évkönyve* 1 (1969), 110, 113–4.

92 Horváth and Hatházi, “Pechenegi i kuny. Arkheologicheskoye nasledie,” 16–7.

93 Alán Kralovánszky, “Szarvasmarha-temetkezés a honfoglalás korából,” *A Magyar Mezőgazdasági Múzeum Közleményei* 2 (1964), 171–84.

94 Idem, “Honfoglaló őseink szarvasmarha-kultusza,” in *Az őshazától a Kárpátokig*, ed. Viktor Szombathy (Budapest: Panoráma, 1985), 360–74.

95 *Arkheologiya Vengrii. Konets II tysyacheletiya do n.e. – I tysyacheletiya n.e.*, 332–4. See also: István Erdélyi, “O pechenegakh na territorii Vengrii: k postanovke voprosa,” in *Materialy I tys. n.e. po arkheologii i istorii Ukrainy i Vengrii*, 163–6; László Révész, “Die Gräberfelder des Komitates Heves im 10.–11. Jahrhundert,” *Acta Archaeologica ASH* 59 (2008), no. 2, 457–67.

96 András Pálóczi-Horváth, “Nomád népek a kelet-európai steppén és a középkori Magyarországon,” in *Zúduló sasok: Új honfoglalók – besenyők, kunok, jászok – a középkori Alföldön és a Mezőföldön*, eds. Gabor Hatházi et al. (Gyula: Erkel Ferenc Múzeum, 1996), 17–36; Gabor Hatházi, “Besenyők és kunok a Mezőföldön,” in *Zúduló sasok*, 37–56; László

Writing about Pecheneg presence in Hungary, Gábor Hatházi traditionally bemoaned the sporadic nature of the archaeological materials (due among other reasons to the similarity of Pecheneg burials with those of the Hungarians of the early period) and relied primarily on written sources<sup>97</sup> and place names. In his view, the majority of Pecheneg settlements in Mezőföld (part of the Pannonian Basin) in the 10th to 12th centuries were located in the valley of the river Sárvíz, where Pechenegs guarded an intersection of trade and pilgrimage routes from Western Europe to Byzantium in the service of the Hungarian state.<sup>98</sup> The Hungarians had no qualms handing over to Pechenegs the swampy lands that were ill-suited for farming but acceptable for grazing livestock.<sup>99</sup> Ferenc Horváth and Gábor Hatházi argued that the Pecheneg population in Árpáadian-era Hungary (11th to 13th centuries) was not large – one or two percent of the total or even less.<sup>100</sup>

Árpád Nagy (1945–89), László Selmeczi, Gábor Hatházi, Zsolt Petkes, Ferenc Horvát, János Gábor Ódor, and other Hungarian scholars<sup>101</sup> have published

- 
- Selmeczi, “Régészeti ásatások a Nagykunszágon,” in *Zúduló sasok*, 57–66; Idem, “A jászok betelepülése a régészeti leletek tükrében,” in *Zúduló sasok*, 67–80.
- 97 Gyula Kristó published an article on charters that describe regulated medieval burials (including Pecheneg) in Hungary. From 1100 on, the law mandated burial in church cemeteries: Gyula Kristó, “Sírhelyekre vonatkozó adatok korai,” *Acta Historica* 71 (1981), 21–8.
- 98 Hatházi, “Besenyők és kunok a Mezőföldön,” map on p. 40. For the distribution of Cumans in Mezőföld, see map on p. 49. Overall, there are 150 known Pecheneg settlements across the territory of modern Hungary: *Hungarian Archaeology at the Turn of the Millennium*, ed. Zsolt Visy (Budapest: Department of Monuments of the Ministry of National Cultural Heritage, 2003), 389. Györffy wrote about 190 settlements that could be linked to the Pechenegs: Györffy, *A magyarság keleti elemei*, 123–67. Pálóczi-Horváth’s estimate was more modest: there were 46 medieval settlements with Pecheneg property holders, and 30 to 32 villages were “either entirely or partly Pecheneg”: Pálóczi-Horváth, *Peoples of Eastern Origin in Medieval Hungary*, 265.
- 99 Hatházi, “Besenyők és kunok a Mezőföldön,” 43–4.
- 100 Horváth and Hatházi, “Pechenegi i kuny. Arkheologicheskoye nasledie,” 11.
- 101 Árpád Nagy, “Eger környéki és Tisza-vidéki besenyő települései X–XI. században (Kísérlet a magyarországi besenyő régészeti hagyatékának meghatározására),” *Egri Múzeum Évkönyve* 7 (1969), 129–57; László Selmeczi, “A szállástó a faluig. Adatok a magyarországi kunok településtörténetéhez,” *Arany János Múzeum Közleményei* 4 (1986), 193–213; Idem, “A kunok nomadizmusának kérdéséhez,” *Hermane Ottó Múzeum Évkönyve* 25–26 (1986–1987), 177–87; Idem, *A Négyzállási I. számú jász temető* (Budapest: Budapesti Történeti Múzeum, 1992); *Régészeti-néprajzi tanulmányok a jászokról és a kunokról* (Folklor és etnográfia, 64) (Debrecen: KLTE, 1992); Gábor Hatházi, “A besenyő megtelepedés régészeti nyomai Fejér megyében,” *Savaria: a Vas megyei múzeumok értesítője* 22/3 (1996), 223–48; Idem, *A kunok régészeti emlékei a Kelet-Dunántúlon (Die archäologischen Funde der Kumanen in Ost-Transdanubien)* (Budapest: Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum, 2004); Zsolt Petkes, “12. századi temetőrészlet Sárbogárd-Templom-dűlőből. Újabb régészeti



archaeological studies of Pecheneg, Oghuz, Cuman, and Jász (Iasian, Alanic) material remains. Some attention has been paid to the anthropometric study of human remains from nomadic burials.<sup>102</sup>

András Pálóczi-Horvát's<sup>103</sup> book *Pechenegs, Cumans, Iasians: Steppe Peoples in Medieval Hungary*,<sup>104</sup> translated into several languages, is of particular note. Despite his specialization in material culture (reconstruction of settlements, clothes), Pálóczi-Horváth relies primarily on written sources, using archaeological finds as illustrations (the chapter on the Pechenegs is illustrated with, among others, images of leaf-shaped pendants with a “tree-of-life” motif and rigid mouthpieces).<sup>105</sup> The author briefly summarizes the history of the Pechenegs for the general reader, touches on their relations with the Hungarians and neighboring states, describes the main features of their

---

adatok a Sárvíz-völgy 10-12. századi történetéhez,” *Alba Regia* 35 (2006), 93–124; Idem, “Friedhofabschnitt aus dem XII. Jahrhundert in der sárbogárdi Kirchengruft: Neue archäologische Berichte zur Geschichte des Sárvíz-Tales aus dem 10.-12. Jahrhundert,” *Alba Regia* 36 (2007), 89–125; Ferenc Horváth, *A csengelei kunok ura és népe* (Budapest: Archaeolingua, 2001); Idem, “Újabb kun vezéri sír leletei a Kiskunságból: Kiskunmajsa–Kuklis-tanya (Die Funde eines neuen kumanischen Führergrabes in Kleinkumanien: Kiskunmajsa – Kuklis-Gehöft),” *A Móra Ferenc Múzeum Évkönyvei: Studia Archaeologica* 9 (2003), 369–86; János Gábor Ódor, “Honfoglalás- és kora Árpád-kori soros temetők sírleleteinek katasztere Tolna megyében,” *A Wosinsky Mór Múzeum Évkönyve* 21 (1999), 151–73. For a more detailed bibliography of “nomadic archaeology” in Hungary, see: Horváth and Hatházi, “Pechenegi i kuny. Arkheologicheskoye nasledie,” 79–87.

- 102 See: Antonia Marcsik, “Antropologicheskaya kharakteristika srednevekovogo kunsogo i vengerskogo naseleniya (kratkij obzor),” in *Tyurkskiye kochevniki v Azii i Yevrope*, 114–9.
- 103 A bibliography of Pálóczi-Horváth's works to 2014 can be found in: “Pálóczi Horváth András publikációinak jegyzéke,” in *“Carmen miserabile”. A tatárjárás magyarországi emlékei. Tanulmányok Pálóczi Horváth András 70. születésnapja tiszteletére*, eds. Szabolcs Rosta and György Székely (Kecskemét: Katona József Múzeum, 2014), 9–20. The most important of them include András Pálóczi-Horváth, “Situation des recherches archéologiques sur les Comans en Hongrie,” *Acta Orientalia ASH* 27 (1973), no. 2, 201–9; Idem, “L’immigration et l’établissement des Comans en Hongrie,” *Acta Orientalia ASH* 29 (1975), no. 3, 313–33; Idem, “Le costume Coman au moyen âge,” *Acta Archaeologica ASH* 32 (1980), no. 1–4, 403–27.
- 104 András Pálóczi-Horváth, *Besenyők, Kunok, Jászok* (Budapest: Corvina, 1989); an English version came out as *Pechenegs, Cumans, Iasians: Steppe Peoples in Medieval Hungary* (Budapest: Corvina, 1989).
- 105 *Ibid.*, 19–21 and 34. In the 1989 English translation from Hungarian, the term “unjoined snaffle” is used. Among other artifacts of the Pecheneg type, Pálóczi-Horváth distinguishes round stirrups, five-ringed discs, and scissors: *Ibid.*, 24. At the same time, the author notes that “the number of secure finds is extremely small – a circumstance which makes it difficult to differentiate Pecheneg graves from the archaeological remains of other steppe peoples of the same era,” *Ibid.*, 19.

material culture, and outlines the process of their settlement in Hungary.<sup>106</sup> Pálóczi-Horváth links the beginning of Pecheneg migration into the country with the Pecheneg-Byzantine conflicts of the period.<sup>107</sup> An expanded version of this book, incorporating fresh archaeological data and featuring a new chapter on the Oghuzes, came out in 2014.<sup>108</sup> In a paper delivered at the conference “Connection between Cultures” (Vienna, November 2003), Pálóczi-Horváth drew attention to the significant Byzantine influences on the Cumans in the 11th to 13th centuries.<sup>109</sup>

General works on nomadic archaeology have been authored by István Erdélyi<sup>110</sup> and Csanád Bálint.<sup>111</sup> Bálint’s views on what he calls *Steppenfixierung* or “Orient-preference” in Central and Eastern European archaeology are particularly noteworthy: he “... a) regards the Orient as being globally independent, namely regarding time, space, the ethnic and political circumstances of the data under consideration and b) all ethnographical specifications of peoples of the Asian steppes and of Siberia, even up until the 20th century, as being directly relevant for the archaeology of East and Central-European peoples of the steppes in the early Middle Ages.”<sup>112</sup> The Hungarian archaeologist believes that it is wrong to blindly superimpose the material-culture traditions of Asian nomads onto peoples that lived for extended periods of time under the influence of their European neighbors (the Avars, Hungarians, and Proto-Bulgarians). This point is also valid for the Pechenegs, Oghuzes, and Cumans, who during the 9th to 13th centuries migrated thousands of kilometers to the west and engaged in active cultural exchange with

106 Ibid., 7–38.

107 Ibid., 31. Ferenc Horváth and Gábor Hatházi see these Pechenegs as settlers of the “second wave” (the first wave was the Pechenegs that settled in Hungary during the times of Prince Taksony) and believe that these second-wave settlers enjoyed more privileges and preserved their ethnic identity for longer (Horváth and Hatházi, “Pechenegi i kuny. Arkheologicheskoye naslediyе,” 14).

108 Pálóczi-Horváth, *Peoples of Eastern Origin in Medieval Hungary*.

109 Idem, “Traditions nomades et influences byzantines dans la culture des Comans établis en Hongrie au Moyen Âge.” Available at: [https://www.inst.at/kulturen/2003/05literaturen/sektion\\_hima\\_paloczi.htm](https://www.inst.at/kulturen/2003/05literaturen/sektion_hima_paloczi.htm). Accessed on 10 January 2022.

110 István Erdélyi, *A Bajkáltól a Balatonig. Régészeti adatok a töröknyelvű népek történetéhez* (Budapest: Dunamelléki Református Egyházkerület Ráday Nyomdája, 1997).

111 Csanád Bálint, *Die Archäologie der Steppe. Steppenvölker zwischen Volga und Donau vom 6. bis zum 10. Jahrhundert*, ed. Falko Daim (Vienna: Böhlau, 1989).

112 Csanád Bálint, “On ‘Orient-preference’ in Archaeological Research on the Avars, Proto-Bulgarians and Conquering Hungarians,” in *Post-Roman Towns, Trade and Settlement in Europe and Byzantium*, vol. 1, *The Heirs of the Roman West*, ed. Joachim Henning (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2007), 547.

Rus’ (including Scandinavian elements<sup>113</sup>), Byzantium, Hungary, Bulgaria,<sup>114</sup> Poland, and the local populations of the North Pontic steppe, Crimea,<sup>115</sup> and the Carpathian-Danubian-Balkan region.<sup>116</sup> Miklós Makoldi stresses the importance of three factors that defined the life of the inhabitants of the “zone of the so-called ‘Byzantine border culture’ (e.g. the Carpathian Basin and Bulgaria)” in the 6th to 11th centuries: “local innovations,” Byzantine influence, and “Eastern, steppe influence.”<sup>117</sup>

To sum up, the achievements of 19th- and early 20th-century Hungarian scholars in the study of non-Hungarian nomads, their archaeological record, languages, and Latin, Byzantine and Oriental sources for their history owed much to the fascination with nomads then prevalent in Hungarian historiography. On the other hand, the political situation after Hungary’s defeat in World War II, and even more so after the Revolution of 1956, compelled some Hungarian historians to stress the negative impact of nomads and the Germanic cultural element on Hungarian history, as opposed to the positive influence exerted by the Slavs. Nevertheless, even under the communist rule, Hungarian archaeology and medieval, Oriental, and Byzantine studies made great contributions to our understanding of the past of the Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans within the framework of Hungarian and European history.

The fall of the Berlin Wall and the country’s entry into the EU have brought about changes in the way Hungarian historians perceive their nation’s nomadic past and the place of other nomadic peoples in Hungarian history. Csanád Bálint has stressed the need to move away from the *Steppenfixierung* (or “Orient-preference”) and pay more attention to the European component of early Hungarian history. Nonetheless, political fashions aside, Hungarian Orientalists, historians, and archaeologists continue to play a key role in the study of the late nomads of Eastern Europe.<sup>118</sup>

113 See, for instance, Pálóczi-Horváth, *Pechenegs, Cumans, Iasians*, 22.

114 *Odürtsi*, 2, 245.

115 Vadym V. Mayko, *Vostochnyy Krym vo vtoroy polovine X–XII vv.* (Kyiv: Vydavets’ Oleh Filyuk, 2014), 209.

116 Silviu Oța, “Pieșe de orfevrărie de tradiție bizantină în spațiul Nord-Dunărean (secolul al XI-lea-începutul secolului al XIII-lea),” in *Între Stepă și Imperiu. Studii în onoarea lui Radu Harhoiu*, eds. Andrei Măgureanu and Erwin Gáll (Bucharest: Renaissance, 2010), 403–33.

117 Miklós Makoldi, “Bulgaria – the link between the Steppe and the Carpathian Basin along the Danube,” in *Avars, Bulgars and Magyars*, 59.

118 “The late nomads” is a technical term denoting the Pechenegs, Uzes, Cumans, and “Mongol-Tatars,” introduced in Soviet historiography in the mid-20th century. It is still popular among scholars in Eastern and Southeastern Europe (Russian: *pozdniye kochevniki*; Romanian: *nomazii târzii*; Bulgarian: *kŭsni nomadi*). Rumen Ivanov considers this term unacceptable: Rumen Ivanov, Rosen Ivanov and Georgi Tomov, *Medieval Nomad*

### 3 Romanian Historiography

Of the nations that ended up in the Soviet sphere of influence after 1945, in Romania historical scholarship may have found itself under the heaviest political pressure.<sup>119</sup> Industrialization, the entrenchment of the Marxist doctrine with its demand that every idea must have material confirmation, and the recovery of previously lost territories all were factors in the notable expansion of archaeological excavations across the country, especially after 1948.<sup>120</sup>

The principal mission of Romanian archaeology in the post-war decades was to create a source base for research into the origin of the Romanian people. With that aim, a special Commission for the Study of the Formation of the Romanian Language and People was set up in 1956 at the Romanian Academy of Sciences.<sup>121</sup>

A significant success in this direction came with the discovery near the village of Dridu (in the vicinity of Bucharest) of materials belonging to a culture characterized by Ion Nestor,<sup>122</sup> the archaeologist in charge of the excavations,

---

*Necropolis from Plovdiv (11th–13th C.)* (Plovdiv: Studio 18, 2016), 16. Peter Golden uses the term “pre-Činggisid nomads” for the Pechenegs, Uzès, and Cumans.

- 119 Gheorghe I. Brătianu (1898–1953), a prominent Romanian medievalist, was arrested in 1950 by the *Securitatea* and died in prison. (Brătianu studied trade in the Black Sea region and touched on the subject of Pecheneg-Byzantine relations: Gheorghe I. Brătianu, *Marea Neagră. De la origini până la cucerirea otomană*, ed. Victor Spinei (Iași: Polirom, 1999), 213). On this subject, see also: Florin Müller, *Politică și istoriografia în România, 1948–1964* (Cluj: Editura Nereamia Napocae, 2003); Florin Curta, “The Changing Image of the Early Slavs in the Romanian Historiography. A Critical Survey,” *RÉSEER* 32 (1994), 129–42; Radu-Alexandru Dragoman and Sorin Oanță-Marghitu, “Archaeology in Communist and Post-Communist Romania,” *Dacia* 50 (2006), 62–5.
- 120 Alexandru Madgearu, “The Dridu Culture and the Changing Position of Romania among the Communist States,” *AB* 11 (2007), no. 2, 51. The scale of archaeological research across the Romanian People’s Republic in the late 1940s and 1950s can be glimpsed from the following works: Enric Frances, “Vizantinovedeniye v Rumynskoy Narodnoy Respublike (1948–1958),” *VizVrem* 16 (1959), 308–316; Idem, “Vizantinovedeniye v Rumynskoy Narodnoy Respublike v 1956–1961 gg.,” *VizVrem* 22 (1963), 108–23; Traian Lungu, Petre Diaconu and Ștefan Olteanu, “Le développement de l’historiographie roumaine au cours du dernier quart de siècle,” *RRH* (1969), no. 4, 774–81; Emil Condurachi, “La contribution des recherches archéologiques roumaines à la connaissance du limes romano-byzantin du Bas-Danube,” *RRH* (1969), no. 3, 443–53; Eugenia Zaharia and Bucur Mitrea, “Sur le développement de l’archéologie et de la numismatique en Roumanie,” *RRH* (1971), no. 1, 101–27.
- 121 Ivan Bozhilov, “Kulturata Dridu i Pürvoto Bülgarsko tsarstvo,” *IstPreg* (1970), no. 4, 116: “The creation of this coordinatory body led to the intensification of systematic archaeological excavations throughout the country and rethinking of some established facts and views.”
- 122 About him: Gheorghe Ștefan, “Ion Nestor. In memoriam,” *Dacia* 19 (1975), 5–8.

as proto-Romanian.<sup>123</sup> This view found its chief opponent in Maria Comșa.<sup>124</sup> Other Romanian and foreign archaeologists and historians were also gradually drawn into the debate.<sup>125</sup>

Differences of opinion regarding their “ethnic” attribution notwithstanding, it is an indisputable fact that many settlements of the Dridu (or Balkan-Danubian) culture exhibit signs of destruction and fire, which scholars from many countries associate with the Pecheneg migration into the Dniester-Danube basin. Thus, in her paper delivered in 1962 at a joint Bulgaro-Romanian seminar, Comșa pointed out that it was Pecheneg incursions that halted the development of the Balkan-Danubian culture in Moldova, Muntenia, and Oltenia.<sup>126</sup> In an earlier work, published in 1958, she stressed that the arrival of the nomads in Moldova caused a drain of the region’s Slavic population to the north and created conditions for the Romanization of this territory.<sup>127</sup> Comșa went beyond simple negative portrayals of the coming of

- 
- 123 Ion Nestor, “Contributions archéologiques au problème des Proto-Roumains. La civilisation de Dridu. Note préliminaire,” *Dacia* 2 (1958), 371–82.
- 124 About her: Ștefan Olteanu, “Necrolog Maria Comșa (1982–2002),” *Thraco-Dacica* 23 (2002), no. 1–2, 324–7; Florin Curta, “Marksizm v rabotakh Marii Komsha,” 29–41.
- 125 See, for instance, Ion Nestor, “L’établissement des slaves en Roumanie à la lumière de quelques découvertes archéologiques récentes,” *Dacia* 5 (1961), 429–48; Maria Comșa, “Cu privire la evoluția culturii balcano-dunărene în secolele IX–XI (Studiu preliminar),” *sciv* (1963), no. 1, 107–22; Eugenia Zaharia, *Săpăturile de la Dridu. Contribuție la arheologia și istoria perioadei de formare a poporului român* (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1967); Stefka Angelova and Lyudmila Doncheva-Petkova, “Süstavüt na naselenieto v Dobrudzha ot kraya na X do kraya na XI v.,” in *Vtori mezhdunaroden kongres*, 380–1; Vasilka Tüpkova-Zaimova, “Rolyata i administrativna organizatsiya na t. nar. ‘Otvüddunavska Bülgariya,’” in *Studia Balcanica* 2 (1970), 63–96. The Greek historian Faidon Malingoudis criticizes all sides in the scholarly debate surrounding the Dridu culture, characterizing their arguments as “benign lies.” In his view, an archaeological culture cannot speak to the ethnic identity of its bearers. See Gennadiï G. Litavrin, “Novoye issledovaniye o vosstanii v Paristrione i obrazovanii Vtorogo Bolgarskogo tsarstva,” *VizVrem* 41 (1980), 92–4. The “political circumstances” of the discussion around the Dridu culture are illuminated in Madgearu’s article “The Dridu Culture and the Changing Position of Romania among the Communist States.”
- 126 Maria Comșa, “La civilisation balkano-danubienne (IXe–XIe s.) sur le territoire de la R.P. Roumaine (origine, évolution et appartenance ethnique). Étude préliminaire,” *Dacia* 7 (1963), 436.
- 127 Eadem, “Slavii de răsărit pe teritoriul R.P.R. și pătrunderea elementului Romanic în Moldova pe baza datelor arheologice,” *sciv* (1958), no. 1, 73–89. Georgii Fyodorov was even more categorical in his interpretation: “As a result of nomadic assault, the brilliant material culture of the Slavs of the USSR’s Southwest was obliterated” (Georgii Fyodorov, “Rezultatele și problemele principale ale cercetărilor arheologice din Sud-Vestul URSS referidoare la primul mileniu al e.n.,” *sciv* 10 (1959), no. 2, 405).

the nomads.<sup>128</sup> She raised such questions as the attribution of the region's pottery (some of which may have been of nomadic provenance),<sup>129</sup> the impact that the advancement of the Pechenegs and Cumans towards the Byzantine border had on the Dridu culture, and the role of these tribes in the ethnogenesis of the Romanians.

In 1950, during rescue excavations accompanying the construction of a canal from the Danube to the Black Sea, a stone slab was found in the ruins of an old fortress near the village of Mircea Vodă in Northern Dobruja. It bore a Cyrillic inscription: "Greeks ... 6451 ... župan Dimitr" (first described by Eugen Comşa and Dorin Popescu).<sup>130</sup> Some scholars connected this find with a Magyar or Pecheneg raid.<sup>131</sup> Excavations undertaken in the 1950s by the Romanian archaeologists Gheorghe Ştefan, Bucur Mitrea, Ion Barnea, Dumitru Protase, Virgil Vătăşianu, Petre Diaconu, and others in the Romanian part of Dobruja laid the foundation for the development of a new source base for the study of Byzantine history. Drawing on new evidence (chiefly coins and seals),<sup>132</sup> Romanian scholars began to stress an early establishment of Byzantine presence along the Danube<sup>133</sup> and a significant role of the local

- 
- 128 Maria Chişvasi-Comşa, "Unele concluzii istorice pe baza ceramicii din secolele VI–XII," *SCIV* 8 (1957), no. 1–4, 291; Eadem, "Die Bulgarische Herrschaft nördlich der Dunau während des IX und X Jahrhundert im Lichte der archeologischen Forschungen," *Dacia* 4 (1960), 395–422; Eadem, "K voprosu istolkovaniya nekotorykh grafitti iz Basarabi," *Dacia* 8 (1964) 366–9.
- 129 She viewed the clay kettles as Proto-Bulgarian: Eadem, "Unele concluzii istorice pe baza ceramicii din secolele VI–XII," *SCIV* 8 (1957), no. 1–4, 278.
- 130 Eugen Comşa and Dorin Popescu, "Cercetări arheologice pe trasul canalului Dunăre – Marea Neagră," *SCIV* 2 (1951), no. 1, 170.
- 131 Damian P. Bogdan, "Drevneslavyanskiye grafiti, obnaruzhennyye v Dobrudzhe. Dobrudzhanskaya nadpis' 943 goda," in *IV Mezhdunarodnyy s'yezd slavistov. Materialy diskussii*, vol. 2, *Problemy slavyanskogo yazykoznaniiya*, ed. Nikita I. Tolstoï (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1962), 139–40; Vasil Gyuzelev, "Dobrudzhanskiyat nadpis i sübitiyata v Bülgariya prez 943 g.," *IstPreg* (1968), no. 6, 40–8.
- 132 See, for instance, Ion Barnea and Ştefan Ştefănescu, *Din istoria Dobrogei*, vol. 3, *Byzantini, Români şi Bulgari la Dunărea de Jos* (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1971), 96.
- 133 Ion Barnea, "Relaţiile dintre aşezarea de la Biseriçuta – Garvân şi Bizanţ în secolele X–XII," *SCIV* 4 (1953), no. 3–4, 642; Alexandru Grecu [Petre P. Panaitescu], "Bulgaria în Nordul Dunării în veacurile al IX–X-lea," *SCIM* 1 (1950), no. 1, 223–36. See also: Oana Damian, "Despre prezenţa politică bizantină la Dunărea de Jos în secolele VII–X," in *Prinos lui Petre Diaconu*, 283–318. At the same time, the view that in the last quarter of the 10th century the Byzantine power on the Lower Danube was nominal became firmly established in Romanian historiography after 1967. For objections to it, see Peter Frankopan, "The Numismatic Evidence from the Danube Region 971–1092," *BMGS* 21, (1997), 31; Vasilka Tŭpkova-Zaimova and Dimitŭr Stoimenov, "Otnovo na Dolni Dunav (kraya na X–XI v.).

(in their view, Romanian) population in the region.<sup>134</sup> These excavations also uncovered many settlements with extensive traces of fires, which could be dated using coins found in the burn layers, as well as remains of Byzantine fortifications and objects of material culture possibly belonging to 10th- and 11th-century nomads.<sup>135</sup>

In the 1950s, one of the supervisors of the excavations in Dinogetia was Gheorghe Ștefan (1899–1980). His first article on this archaeological site came out as early as 1941.<sup>136</sup> As the work resumed after the war, Ștefan coauthored excavation reports published in the periodicals *sciv*, *Dacia*, and *MCA*, in addition to the collective work *Dinogetia*.<sup>137</sup> The expert in Roman archaeology and epigraphics Grigore Florescu (1892–1960) took part in the work at Dinogetia and Capidava.<sup>138</sup> Eugen Comșa (1923–2008), even though he specialized in the cultures of the Neolith and Bronze Age, authored and coauthored a number of articles and monographs on the medieval archaeology of Dinogetia and an archaeological study of sites along the route of the Danube-Black Sea

---

Istoriografski i izvorovedski problemi,” in *Cherno more mezhdru iztoka i zapada. Reka Dunav: most mezhdru narodî i kulturi. IX Pontiiskie chteniya, Varna, 16-17 mai 2003*, eds. Snezhka Panova et al. (Varna: ASI, 2004), 344–5.

134 Ion Barnea, “Byzance, Kiev et l’Orient sur le Bas-Danube du X au XII siècle,” in *Nouvelles études d’histoire*, vol. 1, *Présentées au Xe Congrès des Sciences historiques, Rome 1955* (Bucharest: Éditions de l’Académie de la République populaire roumaine, 1955), 172–3.

135 Gheorghe Mănuțu-Adameșteanu, “Nashestviya pechenegov na Nizhnem Dunaye (1027–1048 gg.),” *Stratum plus* (2000), no. 6, 349–59.

136 Gheorghe Ștefan, “Dinogetia I,” *Dacia* 7–8 (1941), 401–25.

137 See: Gheorghe Ștefan, Ion Barnea, Maria Comșa and Eugen Comșa, *Dinogetia*, vol. 1, *Așezarea feudală timpurie de la Biseriçuța-Garvân* (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1967). Ștefan was also one of the spokesmen for Romanian historiography’s official view on the problem of the origins of the Romanian people and language, as presented at the 11th Congress of Historical Sciences in Stockholm (1960): Constantin Diacoviciu, Emil Petrovici, Gheorghe Ștefan, “Zur Frage der Entstehung der rumänischen Sprache und des rumänisches Volkes,” in *Nouvelles études d’histoire*, vol. 2, *Publiées à l’occasion du XIe Congrès des sciences historiques. Stockholm, 1960* (Bucharest: Éditions de l’Académie de la République populaire roumaine, 1960), 91–134. On the history of excavations at Dinogetia – Biseriçuța, see: Eugen Paraschiv-Grigore, Daniel Ene and Ioana Paraschiv-Grigore, “70 de ani de cercetări arheologice sistematice la Dinogetia-Biseriçuța,” *Cercetări Arheologice* 17 (2011), no. 1, 133–42.

138 Florescu was a student of one of the founders of Romanian archaeology Vasile Pârvan (1882–1927) and was involved in excavations at Capidava for more than thirty years (since 1927); in his turn, he became mentor to Petre Diaconu and a good number of other young archaeologists – Florian Anastasiu, Dumitru Vilceanu, Mihai Davidescu, Adrian Rădulescu, Radu Florescu, and others. See also: Grigore Florescu, Radu Florescu and Petre Diaconu, *Capidava: Monografie arheologică*, vol. 1 (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Romine, 1958).

Canal.<sup>139</sup> Dumitru Vilceanu published articles on the excavations in Capidava and Păcuiul lui Soare.<sup>140</sup> Historians Petre Șt. Năsturel<sup>141</sup> and Alexandru Bolșacov-Ghimpu<sup>142</sup> also wrote on the historical geography of the region of the Lower Danube.

Ion Barnea (1913–2004)<sup>143</sup> led archaeological excavations at Adamclisi (1947–68), Garvăn-Dinogetia (1946–75), Isaccea-Noviodunum (1953–75), Niculițel (1953–54), Basarabi-Murfatlar (1957–62), and Enisala-Heracleea (1963–64), in addition to other locations.<sup>144</sup> In his work “Byzantium, Kyiv, and the Orient on the Lower Danube in the 10th to 12th Centuries” (1955), Barnea was among the first scholars to demonstrate, drawing on a wealth of archaeological materials, the presence in the region of not only Byzantium, but also Rus’ and Turkic nomads from the North Pontic steppes.<sup>145</sup> Barnea and Cihodaru explained the restoration of the so-called Dobruja Ramparts by the needs of defense against nomadic raids.<sup>146</sup> Perhaps the most-quoted among Ion Barnea’s works are those

- 
- 139 Comșa and Popescu, “Cercetări arheologice pe trasul canalului Dunăre – Marea Neagră”; Eugen Comșa, “Cercetări și observații în legătură cu valurile din Dobrogea,” *SCIV* 2 (1951), no. 2, 233–8.
- 140 Dumitru Vilceanu, “Opaițe din așezarea feudală timpurie de la Capidava,” *SCIV* 12 (1961), no. 2, 395–402; Idem, “Cu privire la data de început a cetății de la Păcuiul lui Soare (r. Adamclisi),” *SCIV* 14 (1963), no. 1, 208–12; Idem, “Debarcaderul și problema poziției geografice a cetății bizantine de la Păcuiul lui Soare,” *SCIV* 18 (1967), no. 4, 593–615; Idem, “Luciuințe de suprafață din secolul al XI-lea la Păcuiul lui Soare,” *Buletinul monumentelor istoric* 41 (1972), no. 4, 63–5; Petre Diaconu and Dumitru Vilceanu, *Păcuiul lui Soare*, vol. 1, *Cetatea bizantină* (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1972).
- 141 Petre Năsturel, “Așezarea orașului Vicina și țărmul de apus al Marii Negre în lumina unui portulan grec,” *SCIV* 8 (1957), no. 1–4, 295–305; Idem, “Peut-on localiser la Petite Preslav à Păcuiul lui Soare? Commentaire à Anne Comnène, Alexiade VIII<sup>e</sup>,” *RÉSEE* 3 (1965), no. 1–2, 17–36; Idem, “Note sur la géographie historique de la Dobroudja chez Constantin Porphyrogenete,” in *Polychronion: Festschrift Franz Dölger zum 75 Geburtstag*, ed. Peter Wirth (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1966), 382–7. Idem, “Mais où donc localiser Vicina?” *BF* 12 (1987), 145–76.
- 142 Alexandru A. Bolșacov-Ghimpu, “La localisation de la cité byzantine de Demnitzikos,” *RÉSEE* 3 (1965), no. 3–4, 543–9; Idem, “Localisations de sites d’époque Romaine et Byzantine dans la zone du Bas-Danube,” *RÉSEE* 11 (1973), no. 3, 553–61.
- 143 About him: Sebastian Morintz, “Ion Barnea la 80 de ani,” *SCIVA* 44 (1993), no. 4, 315–9.
- 144 For instance: Ion Barnea, “Noi contribuții la cunoașterea țășutului în așezarea de la Garvăn (secolele X–XII),” *SCIV* 12 (1961), no. 2, 307–14. The published excavation reports and archival materials still serve as a source for the study of the region’s history.
- 145 Barnea, “Byzance, Kiev et l’Orient,” 173–80. A longer Romanian-language version of the article came out a year earlier: Idem, “Elemente de cultură materială veche rusească și orientală în așezarea feudală (secolele X–XII) de la Dinogetia (Regiunea Galați),” in *Studii și referate privind istoria României. Din lucrările sesiunii largite a secțiunii de științe istorice, filozofice și economico-juridice (21–24 decembrie 1953)*. Part. 1a, ed. Ion Nestor (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Române, 1954), 195–227.
- 146 Barnea and Ștefănescu, *Din istoria Dobrogei*, 3, 112–3 and 119.



on the excavations in the Basarabi (Murfatlar) chalk quarry, 15 km from the city of Constanța.<sup>147</sup> Analyzing drawings, in addition to runic and literal inscriptions found in the quarry,<sup>148</sup> Barnea concluded that they indicated a possible presence in the region of Christianized Pechenegs in Byzantine service.<sup>149</sup> In Barnea's early works, he paid close attention to traces of nomadic culture in excavation materials<sup>150</sup> and explained the evidence of destruction and burning by Pecheneg raids,<sup>151</sup> but continued to rely on written sources and historiography for information on nomads.<sup>152</sup> In his later research, however, material remains became the basis for conclusions concerning the nomadic dimension

- 
- 147 Ion Barnea and Virgil Bilciurescu, “Șantierul arheologic Basarabi (reg. Constanța),” *MCA* 6 (1959), 541–66; Ion Barnea, “Predvaritel'nyye svedeniya o kamennykh pamyatnikakh v Basarabi (Obl. Dobrodzha),” *Dacia* 6 (1962), 293–316; Idem, “Les monuments rupestres de Basarabi en Dobrogea,” *Cahiers archéologiques* 13 (1962), 187–209; Idem, “Ceramica din cariera de cretă de la Basarabi (reg. Dobrogea),” *SCIV* 13 (1962), no. 2, 349–71.
- 148 The bibliography of works devoted to the decipherment of the inscriptions and study of the images found at Murfatlar numbers dozens of entries and includes contributions from not only well-known philologists (Beshevliev, Tryjarski, Kyzlasov) and historians (Diaconu, Popkonstantinov, Atanasov), but also economists (Peter Dobrev) and local school teachers (P. Ivanov from Dobrich). While during the first twenty five years the discussion focused mostly on the “ethnic” attribution of the site (Slavic, Daco-Getian, Avar, Khazar, Proto-Bulgarian, Nordic, etc.), today more effort is being invested into deciphering the runic inscriptions. Here are only some of the relevant works: Gheorghe Mihaila, “Inscripții slave vechi de la Basarabi,” *Studii și cercetări lingvistice* 1 (1964), 38–59; Dimităr Ovcharov, “Za kharaktera i prinadlezhnosta na srednovekovnite risunki ot Basarab (Murfatlar),” *Arkheologiya* (1975), no. 3, 1–10; Constantin Șerban, “Al III-lea Congres Internațional de Turcologie,” *RdI* (1980), no. 1, 180–3; Alexandru Stanculescu-Bîrda, “One Hypothesis: the Decipherment of the Inscriptions from Murfatlar (Basarabi),” *Balkan Studies* 27 (1986), 237–51; Kazimir Popkonstantinov, “Les inscriptions du monastere rupestre près du village Murfatlar (Basarab): Etat, théories et faits,” in *Dobrudža: Études ethno-culturelles*, eds. Dimităr Angelov and Dimităr Ovcharov (Sofia: Académie bulgare des Sciences, 1987), 115–145; Petre Diaconu, “De nouveau au sujet du monument rupestre de Murfatlar,” *RRH* (1988), no. 1–2, 123–6; Georgi Atanasov, “Influences ethno-culturelles dans l'ermitage rupestre près de Murfatlar, à Dobrudža,” *BS* 57 (1996), no. 2, 112–24.
- 149 Barnea, “Predvaritel'nyye svedeniya o kamennykh pamyatnikakh,” 310–311 and 313. This conclusion was further confirmed by the discovery of a chalk copy of a grave-stone sculpture typical for the Eurasian steppes. In a later article, Barnea considered another find from the region – an image of a woman carved on green schist – and argued that it was a Pecheneg imitation of an anthropomorphic stone stele (*baba*): Idem, “L'idol féminin ou 'kamennaia baba,'” *SCIV* 13 (1962), no. 1, 191–6.
- 150 Barnea, “Elemente de cultură materială veche rusească,” 206.
- 151 Gheorghe Ștefan, Ion Barnea, Bucur Mitrea et al., “Săpăturile de la Gârvan (Dinogetia),” *SCIV* 2 (1951), no. 2, 46–9; “Șantierul Gârvan (Dinogetia),” *SCIV* 3 (1952), 47; “Șantierul Gârvan-Dinogetia,” 272.
- 152 Barnea, “Elemente de cultură materială veche rusească și orientală în așezarea feudală (secolele X–XII) dei Dinogetia (Regiunea Galați),” 217; Idem, “Byzance, Kiev et l'Orient,” 179.

of the region's history, substantially supplementing the known written sources. Given the significant amount of "Oriental" archaeological finds, the "nomadic" theme gradually gained a firm foothold in Romanian historiography.

A collaborative paper by Ion Barnea, Emil Condurachi, and Petre Diaconu, "New Research on the Byzantine *Limes* on the Lower Danube in the 10th to 11th Centuries," delivered in 1966 at the 13th International Congress of Byzantine Studies in Oxford,<sup>153</sup> became an important scholarly milestone precisely because it introduced the research community to new sources.<sup>154</sup> A year later, a collection of papers entitled *Dinogetia* was published in Bucharest, summing up the results of the archaeological exploration of that antique and Byzantine settlement from 1939 to 1962.<sup>155</sup> In 1971, Barnea and Ștefan Ștefănescu coauthored a third volume of *The History of Dobruja*, subtitled *Byzantines, Romanians, and Bulgarians on the Lower Danube*.<sup>156</sup> It was a kind of digest of the Romanian scholarship on the history of Dobruja, including earlier Byzantinological studies by Nicolae Bănescu and fresh archaeological excavations.<sup>157</sup> The volume gave considerable attention to the Pechenegs and

153 Emil Condurachi, Ion Barnea and Petre Diaconu, "Nouvelles recherches sur le Limes byzantin du Bas-Danube aux Xe–XIe siècles," in *The Proceedings of the XIIIth International Congress*, 179–94.

154 See: Dimităr Angelov, "Trinadeseti kongres na vizantinistite," *IstPreg* (1966), no. 2, 125. Stamen Mikhailov, "XIII mezhdunaroden kongres po vizantologiya," *Arkheologiya* (1967), no. 1, 74; Zinaida V. Udaltsova, "Nauchnyye itogi XIII Mezhdunarodnogo Kongressa vizantinistov," *VizVrem* 28 (1968), 309–10. It still has not lost its significance: Marko Popović, "Les fortresses du systeme defensif byzantin en Serbie au XIe–XIIe siècle," *Starinar* 42 (1991), 170. Ion Barnea's works on Byzantine numismatics and sigillography and on the administrative organization, trade, and intercultural contacts in the region of the Lower Danube in the 10th to 12th centuries represent an important contribution not only to Romanian scholarship, but also to Byzantine studies in general. See: Nikos Oikonomidès, "Recherches sur l'histoire du Bas-Danube aux X–XI siècles: La Mésopotamie de l'Occident," *RÉSEE* 3 (1965), no. 1, 63–4 and 68; Vasilka Tŭpkova-Zaimova, "L'administration byzantine au Bas-Danube (fin du Xe–XIe s.). Tentative d'une mise au point," *ÉB* 3 (1973), 91, 94, 99 and 102.

155 *Dinogetia*, vol. 1, *Așezarea feudală timpurie de la Biseriçuța-Garvăn*. A number of articles on the medieval period in the town's history were published by Barnea. The scholar returned time and again to the results of the excavations at Dinogetia; among other things, he analysed the nomadic influence on the life of the town and region as a whole: Ion Barnea, "Dinogetia et Noviodunum, deux villes byzantines du Bas-Danube," *RÉSEE* 9 (1971), no. 3, 355–6; Idem, "Dinogetia – ville byzantine du Bas-Danube," *Vizantiná* 10 (1980), 245. Several finds of finished and half-finished leaf-shaped pendant amulets were published in 1967: *Așezarea feudală timpurie de la Biseriçuța-Garvăn*, 281–4. In a 1976 article, Barnea attributed to the late nomads two "rectangular amulets."

156 Barnea and Ștefănescu, *Din istoria Dobrogei*, vol. 3.

157 The publication of the monograph spurred a discussion: Ivan Bozhilov and Vasil Gyuzelev, "[Review of]: Barnea I., Ștefănescu Șt. *Din istoria Dobrogei. Vol. III. Byzantini, Români și*

Cumans.<sup>158</sup> Overall, the three-volume Romanian *History of Dobruja* remained the most complete study of the region’s history for a long time.<sup>159</sup>

Generally, the excavations carried out in Romania between the late 1940s and early 1960s with the goal to create a source base for the study of the history of the Romanian people not only accomplished that goal to a large extent, but also produced new materials for the study of the wider Balkan-Carpathian-North Pontic region. Romanian scholars discovered a layer of archaeological evidence of nomadic presence in the area in the 10th and 11th centuries. Investigation of nomads as a phenomenon in their own right was becoming overdue. Petre Diaconu set out to fill in this blank.

Petre Diaconu (1924–2007)<sup>160</sup> was the first scholar since Vasilevskii to devote a special monographic study to the subject of Byzantine-Pecheneg relations.<sup>161</sup> Eight years later, he completed another large-scale work, this time on the dealings between Byzantium and the Cumans.<sup>162</sup> His involvement in archaeological research began with the excavations at Dinogetia in the early 1950s, in which he took part as a student.<sup>163</sup> Over the course of his career, he worked at such sites as Cernavodă, Capidava (1955–56), Mărculești-Viișoara, Mangalia-Callatis (beginning in 1959), Murfatlar-Basarabi, on the island of Golu (Banului) in

---

*Bulgari la Dunărea de Jos*. București, 1971. 440 p. 130 fig. VII harți,” *IstPreg* (1972), no. 5, 115–25; Ivan Bozhilov, “Srednovekovie,” in *Kratka istoriya na Dobrudzha*, eds. Velko Tonev and Jordan Zarchev (Varna: Georgi Bakalov, 1986), 76; Paul Cernovodeanu, “Nouvelles recherches sur l’histoire de la Dobroudja,” *RRH* (1973), 3, 569–70. Bulgarian historians criticized Barnea’s statements about the short duration of Bulgarian control over Dobruja and the ethnic composition of the region, as well as his “overstatement” of the Vlachs’ role in the history of the Balkans: Bozhilov and Gyuzelev, “[Review of]: Barnea I., Ștefănescu Șt. *Din istoria Dobrogei*,” 117–8, 121. Diaconu engaged in a dispute with Barnea concerning the dating of the so-called Niculițel Ramparts: Petre Diaconu, “Despre datarea ‘circum valației’ și ‘bisericii treflate’ de la Niculițel,” *SCIV* 23 (1972), no. 2, 307–19.

158 See, for instance, Barnea and Ștefănescu, *Din istoria Dobrogei*, 3, 120–130 and 150–2.

159 Bulgarian scholars, in their turn, produced *Kratka istoriya na Dobrudzha* (A Short History of Dobruja), a collection of articles *Dobrudzha: Études ethno-culturelles*, and eventually their own three-volume *History of Dobruja* that began to be published in the mid-1980s.

160 A brief biography and a bibliography of Diaconu’s works can be found in Niculae Conovici, “Petre Diaconu á 70 ans,” *Dacia* 40–42 (1996–1998), 473–4.

161 Diaconu, *Les Petchénègues au Bas-Danube*.

162 Diaconu, *Les Coumans au Bas-Danube*.

163 Beginning in 1954, Diaconu coauthored reports on the excavations at Dinogetia in the archaeological journal *SCIV*; eventually he began publishing his own works on the subject: Petre Diaconu, “Un pandativ globular descoperit la Bisericuța-Garvăn,” *SCIV* 9 (1958) no. 2, 445–9.

1966–67, at Păcuiul lui Soare,<sup>164</sup> Derwent, Tropaeum Traiani (1971–77), and others. It was probably archaeological materials, rich as they were in evidence of nomadic presence on the Lower Danube in the 10th to 12th centuries, that led Diaconu to the study of Byzantine-nomadic relations.

In one of his first published articles, “On Clay Kettles in the Feudal Era” (1956), Diaconu made a valuable observation: he attributed the conoidal clay vessels with round bottoms, dating from the 10th to 13th century and found in many places in Romania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and the USSR, to Pecheneg groups practicing half-sedentary life style.<sup>165</sup> Until then, there had been three main theories regarding the vessels’ origins, ascribing them to the Hungarians, Slavs,<sup>166</sup> or Cumans.<sup>167</sup> After the publication of Diaconu’s article, more specifically an extended version of it, which came out in the journal *Dacia* in 1964,<sup>168</sup> these clay kettles began to be viewed as markers of Pecheneg presence (see above). In the early 1960s, Diaconu got involved in other long-standing scholarly discussions – on the Dobruja Ramparts<sup>169</sup> and on the

164 Păcuiul lui Soare was one of Petre Diaconu’s favorite archaeological sites; he returned to it repeatedly from the early 1950s on: Barbu Cîmpina, “L’influence byzantine sur le Bas-Danube, à la lumière des recherches récentes effectuées en Roumanie,” *RRH* (1962), no. 1, 8. From 1958 to 1973, Diaconu published more than ten articles on the archaeological exploration of this fortress (a few of them in collaboration with other scholars). In 1972, Petre Diaconu and Dumitru Vilceanu came out with *Păcuiul lui Soare. A Byzantine Fortress*; in 1977, Diaconu coauthored a sequel to this study with Silvia Baraschi: Diaconu and Vilceanu, *Păcuiul lui Soare*, vol. 1; Petre Diaconu and Silvia Baraschi, *Păcuiul lui Soare*, vol. 2, *Așezarea medievală (secolele XII–XV)* (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1977). Diaconu initially believed that Păcuiul lui Soare figured in medieval sources as Glavinitsa, but eventually came to identify it with Vicina.

165 Petre Diaconu, “Cu privire la problema căldărilor de lut în epoca feudală timpurie (sec. X–XIII),” *SCIV* 7 (1956), no. 3–4, 437. On the geography of the spread of clay kettles in Romania, see Antal Lukacs, “Observații privind răspîndirea căldărilor de lut pe teritoriul României,” *SCIVA* 35 (1984), no. 4, 320–30; Victor Spinei, “Considerații cu privire la populația locală din zona centrală și meridională a Moldovei în secolele XI–XII,” *Cercetări Istorice* 12–13 (1981–1982), 196–9.

166 It was believed, following the works of Ferenc Pulszky and József Hampel, that nomads were so primitive that they could not produce pottery of their own: Langó, “Archaeological Research on the Conquering Hungarians: A Review,” 231.

167 Dan Teodor, “Cîteva observații în legătura cu căldările de lut descoperite la Răducăneni (r. Huși, reg. Iași),” *SCIV* 14 (1963), no. 1, 204.

168 Diaconu, “K voprosu o glinyanykh kotlakh na territorii RNR.”

169 The ramparts had been known before, but their thorough archaeological study began in the post-war era: Eugen Comșa, “Cercetări și observații în legătură cu valurile din Dobrogea,” *SCIV* 2 (1951), no. 2, 233–8.

fragments of *Toparcha Gothicus* (together with Constantin Cihodaru and Ion Barnea).<sup>170</sup>

In 1965, Diaconu published an article “On the Pechenegs on the Lower Danube in the 10th Century.”<sup>171</sup> In this work, he attempted to prove that the arrival of these nomads in the Danube estuary should be dated to the mid-10th century, rather than late 9th, as had been done by Xenopol, Iorga, Giurescu, Moravcsik, and more or less the entire previous historiographical tradition, based on the evidence of the *DAI*.<sup>172</sup> In Diaconu’s view, the excavations carried out in Romania, Bulgaria, and the Moldavian SSR did not provide sufficient foundation for claiming that the Pechenegs controlled the territories between the Dniester and Danube already at the beginning of the 10th century. The scholar argued for moving the date of their establishment in Moldova to the last third of the 10th century, and in Wallachia – to the end of the 10th and early 11th century.<sup>173</sup> He continued this train of thought in his talk on “The Pechenegs on the Lower Danube in the First Half of the 11th Century,” delivered at the Institute of Archaeology of the Romanian Academy of Sciences on 24 February 1967,<sup>174</sup> in which he proposed a new periodization of Byzantine-Pecheneg relations.<sup>175</sup> Together, these two works became the basis for the monograph *The Pechenegs on the Lower Danube*, which came out in 1970.<sup>176</sup>

---

170 Constantin Cihodaru, “Observații critice asupra însemnărilor ‘Toparhului Bizantin,’” *Studii și cercetări științifice. Istorie* (1961), no. 2, 259–72; Petre Diaconu, “Zur Frage der Datierung des Steinwalles in der Dobrudscha und der Lokalisierung der im Berichte des griechischen Toparchen geschilderten Ereignisse,” *Dacia* 6 (1962), 317–36; Constantin Cihodaru, “Alte precizări în legătură cu valul de piatră din Dobrogea și însemnările toparhului bizantin,” *Anuarul Institutului de istorie și arheologie din Iași* 2 (1965), 261–80; Ion Barnea, “Murfatlar și Niculițel,” *SCIVA* 26 (1975), no. 1, 95–9.

171 Petre Diaconu, “Despre pecenegii la Dunărea de Jos în secolul al X-lea,” *SRDI* 18 (1965), no. 5, 117–29. In French: Idem, “Les Petchénègues du Bas-Danube au Xe siècle,” *Dacia* 11 (1967), 259–70.

172 *Ibid.*, 259–60.

173 *Ibid.* 260–61, 268–70.

174 Petre Diaconu, “Despre pecenegii la Dunărea de Jos în prima jumătate a secolului al XI-lea,” *sciv* 18 (1967), no. 3, 463–76.

175 *Ibid.*, 475–6.

176 This book, in a sense, gathers under one cover a number of Diaconu’s previous works. Thus, the first, second, and fourth chapters represent a rewritten version of the article “On the Pechenegs on the Lower Danube in the 10th Century” (1965), and chapter three is a summary of Diaconu’s earlier observations on the restoration of Danubian fortresses by the Byzantines (Petre Diaconu, “Une information de Skylitzès-Cédrénos à la lumière de l’archéologie,” *RÉSEE* 7 (1969), no. 1, 43–9). The account of the events from the year 1000 to 1048 (chapters five and six of the book) follows the article “The Pechenegs on the Lower Danube in the First Half of the 11th Century” (1967); chapter thirteen relies in

In the introduction to this study, Diaconu stated that he would not take into account toponymic data,<sup>177</sup> due to the insufficiently advanced state of the discipline.<sup>178</sup> But already in his next book (on the Cumans) he devoted an entire chapter to the nomadic footprint in the toponymy of the Lower Danube,<sup>179</sup> even though no new works on the subject appeared in the intervening years. It is more likely that the scholar did not view the existing Turkic place names in the region as Pecheneg (apart from the obvious cases, such as

---

its analysis of the administrative organization of the *theme* of Paristrion on the article “Basil Apokapes and Nikephoros Botaneiates as *Katepanos* of the Lower Danube” (Idem, “Vasile Apokapes și Nikiphor Botaniates – katepani la Dunărea de Jos,” *sciv* 20 (1969), no. 3, 437–51). This does not, however, take away from the scholarly originality of the book for its time.

177 A thorough study of the Turkic (Pecheneg-Cuman) toponymy of the Lower Danube was undertaken by Ion Conea (1902–74) and Ion Donat (1909–88): Ion Conea and Ion Donat, “Contribution à l’Étude de la toponymie Pétchenègue-Comane de la Plaine Roumaine du Bas-Danube,” in *Contributions onomastiques publiées à l’occasion du VIe Congrès International des Sciences onomastiques à Munich du 24 au 28 août, 1958* (Bucharest: Éditions de l’Académie de la République populaire roumaine, 1958), 139–69. Taking as their starting point the hypothesis of the German philologist Gustav Weigand about the Turkic origin of the suffix *-(l)ui* in place names (meaning river or valley), they not only considered the 19 toponyms with that suffix already known by the early 1930s, but also studied place names found in documents concerning landed property, old maps, and other sources, discovering 34 more. Furthermore, the authors counted as toponyms of Pecheneg-Cuman origin those ending in *-cea(-ča)* and those with Turkic roots (Tosun, Uzun etc.) It remains unknown, however, when exactly these names first appeared – during the Pecheneg-Cuman period or later, after the coming of the Mongols or even the Ottoman Turks (Spinei, *The Romanians and the Turkic Nomads*, 321). Maria Matilda Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru delivered a paper at the same Congress of Onomastic Sciences, in which she attempted to clarify the origin of the name Dobruja. In her view, the Arabic name of the region, Ard Burġan, meant “the land of the Bulgars,” and when these territories were occupied by the Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans the new conquerors were referred to by Arab authors as Dhu Bruġan – “masters of Burġan.” Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru also backed the theory of a Seljuk colonization of Dobruja in the 13th century: Maria Matilda Alexandrescu-Dersca, “L’origine du nom de la Dobroudja,” in *Contributions onomastiques publiées à l’occasion du VIe Congrès International des Sciences onomastiques à Munich du 24 au 28 août, 1958*, 97–114. In the 1970s–1990s, significant contributions to Turkic philology, particularly to the study of the *Codex Cumanicus*, the Gagauz language, and the influence of Turkic languages on Romanian and vice versa were made by the Romanian philologist Vladimir Drimba (1924–2003). See: Stoyanov, *Kumanologija: Istoriografski eskizi*, 2, 147–152. Borrowings from the Kipchak language in Romanian have been studied by Maria Mina Lăzărescu-Zobian: *Kipchak Turkic loanwords in Romanian* [Ph.D. thesis] (Columbia University, 1982). See also: Eadem, “Cumania as the Name of Thirteenth Century Moldavia and Eastern Wallachia: Some Aspects of Kipchak – Rumanian Relations,” *Journal of Turkish Studies* 8 (1984), 265–72.

178 Diaconu, *Les Petchénègues au Bas-Danube*, 10.

179 Idem, *Les Coumans*, 26–34.

Peceneaga in Dobruja), based on his own conclusions about the short duration of the Pechenegs’ presence in the area, as opposed to that of the Cumans.<sup>180</sup>

*Les Petchénègues au Bas-Danube* reflected quite fully the state of nomadic studies at the time.<sup>181</sup> Diaconu extended the chronological boundaries of the problem: while Vasilievskii began in 1048, mentioning earlier events only in passing, Diaconu mapped out all the stages in Byzantium’s relations with the Pechenegs – from the late 9th century to the year 1091.<sup>182</sup> He also broadened the geographical reach of investigation, including not only the Pecheneg’s presence to the south of the Danube, but also the history of their gradual entrenchment in Moldova and Wallachia, which became the beachhead for the nomads’ attacks on the empire.

Considering the first Pecheneg raids in 1027–36, Diaconu made a few interesting observations. He located the area from where, in his view, these first assaults originated – the Lower Danubian Plain. This starting point determined the nomads’ target – the *theme* of Βουλγαρία, rather than Παρίστριον.<sup>183</sup> Diaconu also correlated all known nomadic raids with archaeological finds in

180 Ibid., 27 and 34.

181 Reactions to the book in academic periodicals were generally positive. Omeljan Pritsak, author of the article on the Pechenegs in the *ODB*, included Diaconu’s monograph in its very short bibliography, alongside the work of Vasilievskii (as the pioneer of the Byzantine-Pecheneg problem), Pletnyova (as an expert in the nomadic archaeology of the North Pontic region), and Pritsak’s own work. On the other hand, Günter Prinzing’s review irked Diaconu greatly. Reviews: Paul Gautier, in *RÉB* 30 (1972), no. 1, 359; Ștefan Olteanu, in *RRH* (1971), no. 2, 377–8; Ivan Bozhilov, “Les Petchénègues dans l’histoire des terres du Bas-Danube (Notes sur le livre de P. Diaconu, *Les Petchénègues au Bas-Danube*),” *ÉB* 7 (1971), no. 3, 171–4; Günter Prinzing, in *BZ* 66 (1973), 103–6. Diaconu’s response to Prinzing’s review: Petre Diaconu, “À propos des Petchénègues au Bas-Danube,” *RÉSEE* 13 (1975), no. 1, 131–5. See also: Györfy, “Sur la question de l’établissement des Petchénègues en Europe,” 287; Tüpkova-Zaimova, *Dolni Dunav – granichna zona*, 12–3; Dobrolyubskii, *Kochevniki Severo-Zapadnogo Prichernomor’ya v epokhu srednevekov’ya*, 5; Tryjarski, “Pieczyngowie,” 493–4.

182 In his view, that date marked the end of Pecheneg activity south of the Danube; he argued that it was the Cumans who were responsible for the nomadic attack of 1121/22: Idem, *Les Petchénègues au Bas-Danube*, 133–4.

183 Georgi Atanasov also dates the large-scale Pecheneg attack on Dobruja to 1036: Georgi Atanasov, “Anonimnyye vizantiyskiye follisy klassa ‘B’ i nashestviye pechenevov v Dobrudzhu 1036 g.,” *Stratum plus*, 1999, 6, pp. 111–122, map 2 on p. 114. Gheorghe Mănușu-Adameșteanu believes that at least some settlements in Dobruja (Derwent, Capidava, Dinogetia) were indeed destroyed in the Pecheneg raid of 1027, while Păcuiul lui Soare remained unharmed. As for Isaccea, Hârșova, and Nufăru, their fate is still an open question: Mănușu-Adameșteanu, “Nashestviya pechenevov na Nizhnem Dunaye (1027–1048 gg.),” 347–9.

the respective areas.<sup>184</sup> Describing the twelve-year period of peaceful coexistence between the empire and the nomads, Diaconu suggested that its length could be explained not only by the Pechenegs' defeat at the hands of Yaroslav the Wise and intense struggle between the Pechenegs and the Uzes, but also by the existence of a peace treaty negotiated by the *katepano* Katakalon Kekaumenos with Constantinople's troublesome northern neighbors.<sup>185</sup> The period between 1036 and 1048 was a time of economic prosperity in Byzantium's Danubian provinces.<sup>186</sup>

While generally arranging his material chronologically, Diaconu often made digressions when it was necessary to clarify important details, such as the location of an area mentioned in the sources,<sup>187</sup> details of administrative structure, the succession of governors,<sup>188</sup> or the ethnic identity of individuals and groups (entire tribes or populations of particular territories).<sup>189</sup>

There is a tendency in the book to “nudge” the center of Pecheneg activities from lands that can, with reservations, be called “Romanian” (based on the hypothetical presence there of an Eastern Roman population in the Middle Ages and their present-day status as parts of Romania) towards “Bulgarian” regions. For instance, Diaconu endeavored to move the time of the Pechenegs' arrival in the Danube estuary and their establishment in Moldova and Wallachia to as late a date as possible.<sup>190</sup> Further, he surmised that they left Muntenia and Oltenia in the 1040s–1050s and trekked east;<sup>191</sup> he also took every opportunity

184 Diaconu, *Les Petchénègues au Bas-Danube*, 42–8, 78–80.

185 *Ibid.*, 53–5.

186 *Ibid.*, 50–2.

187 *Ibid.*, 34–8, 66–9, 77–8, 121–9.

188 *Ibid.*, 82–99.

189 *Ibid.*, 19, 100–3, 113–5.

190 *Ibid.*, 11–21, 22–5, 34–8. Ion Barnea, Corneliu Popa, Gheorghe Poenaru-Bordea, and Ernest Oberländer-Târnoveanu backed this view: Barnea and Ștefănescu, *Din istoria Dobrogei*, 3, 122; Gheorghe Poenaru Bordea and Corneliu Popa, “Noi date numismatice privind prezențele bizantine în Câmpia Română în secolele IX–XI,” in *Ilfov: File de istorie* (Bucharest: Comitetul de Cultura și Educație Socialistă al Județului Ilfov, 1978), 140; Ernest Oberländer-Târnoveanu, *Monedă și societate pe teritoriile de la Sud și Est de Carpați: (secolele VI–XIV)* (Cluj-Napoca: Editura Nereamia Napocae, 2003), 87–8. On the other hand, the student of nomadic burials Mihai Sâmpetru argued that Pechenegs established a firm foothold north of the Danube already in the final third of the 10th century: Mihai Sâmpetru, “Înmormântări pecenege din Câmpia Dunării,” *sciv* 24 (1973) no. 3, 452–3; *Idem*, “La région du Bas – Danube au X siècle de notre ère,” *Dacia* 18 (1974), 256–61.

191 Diaconu, *Les Petchénègues au Bas-Danube*, 55. Interestingly, Silviu Oța, based on jewelry finds in the North-Danube region, writes that with the appearance of the Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans in Wallachia “the so-called ‘Proto-Bulgarian’ jewelry was replaced with typically Türkic nomad adornments,” while “artifacts that can be related to Türkic



to note the calm and quiet that persisted in Dobruja during nomadic raids,<sup>192</sup> with the latter, according to the scholar, wreaking havoc specifically on the “Bulgarian” lands.<sup>193</sup> Muntenia and Dobruja were also “removed” from the path of Cuman-inflicted destruction in Diaconu’s 1978 monograph.<sup>194</sup>

What was the reason for this?<sup>195</sup> It is no secret that since as far back as Herodotus, the presence of nomads on territories populated by farmers was seen as a negative factor – a source of destruction, cultural decline, and eventually delayed development.<sup>196</sup> It was their people’s prolonged struggle against nomads that Romanian historiography used to explain the late crystallization of first significant Romanian states (after 1300).<sup>197</sup> At the same time, reluctance

---

nomads have been so far totally absent in Oltenia”: Oța, “*Piese deorfevrărie de tradiție bizantină*,” 430.

192 Diaconu, *Les Petchénègues au Bas-Danube*, 41, 64, 70–2.

193 *Ibid.*, 40–7, 64–5, 68–9, 76, 94, 114, 124.

194 Diaconu, *Les Coumans*, 40, 51.

195 In the words of Gheorghe-Alexandru Niculescu, “The ‘migrators’ are usually credited with a ‘nominal domination’ over the local population, exerted from a big distance, preferably from outside the Romanian national territory”: Gheorghe-Alexandru Niculescu, “Nationalism and the Representation of Society in Romanian Archaeology,” in *Nation and National Ideology. Past, Present and Prospects Proceedings of the International Symposium held at the New Europe College, Bucharest, april. 6–7, 2001*, ed. Irina Vainovski-Mihai (Bucharest: New Europe College, 2002), 223.

196 *Ibid.*, 220: “Autochthony is seen as a state of normality: the local people have the privilege of progress, they would be in a continuous process of evolution without the foreigners who, by their invasions, have slowed it, evidently, always for a short time.” Spinei, *The Romanians and the Turkic Nomads*, 350: “The nomads had a considerably negative influence on local society, and were primarily responsible for the delayed formation of local political entities.” Victor Spinei and Silviu Oța proposed another solution to the problem. In their view, nomadic and settled populations could coexist in the same territory, because they occupied different ecological niches: *Ibid.*, 310; Oța, “*Piese de orfevrărie de tradiție bizantină*,” 422 and 430. Nicolae-Șerban Tanașoca (1941–2017) rejected the thesis that nomads hinder the progress of civilization. But his ideas met with little acceptance: Nicolae-Șerban Tanașoca, “Les Mixobarbares et les formations politiques paristriennes du XIe siècle,” *RRH* (1973), no. 1, 76–7; Lilia Zabolotnaia, “[Review of:] *Eyul mediu timpuriu în Moldova. (Probleme de istorografie și istorie urbană)*.” / Coordinator – Demir Dragnev, Chișinăv, 1994, 170 p.,” *Revista de istorie a Moldovei* (1995), no. 1, 68–70. The deliberations of the Romanian anthropologist Henri H. Stahl on the coexistence of nomadic and sedentary populations appear particularly interesting. He reasoned that nomadic peoples’ demand for tribute was instrumental in bringing about social stratification in agricultural societies. See: Curta, “Marksizm v rabotakh Marii Komsha,” 34.

197 See, for instance, Dinu Giurescu, *Kartiny iz istorii rumynskogo naroda* (Bucharest: Sport-Turizm, 1982), 86; Juliusz Demel, *Historia Rumunii* (Wrocław/Warsaw/Cracow: Ossolineum, 1970), 87–8; Ștefan Ștefănescu, “Postoyannaya bor’ba v zashchitu zemli predkov,” *Rumyniya. Stranitsy istorii* (1988), no. 1, 64.

to “lag behind” other nations<sup>198</sup> led to the appearance of the thesis that autonomous Romanian (or at least involving Romanian population) political structures existed as early as the 9th and 10th centuries – the Gelou, Menumorout, and Glad voivodeships north of the Danube.<sup>199</sup> The next political entities claimed as fully or partially Romanian were the north-Danubian territories of Bulgaria (they supposedly gained autonomy with the latter’s weakening and were even involved in Sviatoslav’s campaigns),<sup>200</sup> as well as the dominions of Tatous, Seslav, and Satzas<sup>201</sup> and the Asen state.<sup>202</sup> This historiographical tradition originated in the works of Iorga, Necșulescu,<sup>203</sup> and Bănescu, and was continued by Cămpina, Ștefănescu, C.C. Giurescu, and other Romanian historians.

Barbu Cămpina (1923–59)<sup>204</sup> gave a talk at a Byzantine studies conference in Prague in 1957 on “Byzantine Influence on the Lower Danube in Light of Recent Archaeological Excavations in Romania,” in which he proposed a periodization

- 
- 198 Dinu Giurescu outlined a chronology of the emergence of states in Moravia, Poland, Hungary, Ireland, Sweden, Norway, and Rus’ and pointed out that it coincided with the timeline of the creation of the first Romanian voivodeships: Giurescu, *Kartiny iz istorii rumynskogo naroda*, 85.
- 199 Ștefan Ștefănescu, “Rumyno-bolgarskiye svyazi v IX–XIV vv. i stanovleniye rumynskoy gosudarstvennosti,” *Romanoslavica* 9 (1963), 533; Giurescu, “Kartiny iz istorii rumynskogo naroda,” 81; Tudor Sălăgean, *Țara lui Gelou. Contribuții la istoria Transilvaniei de Nord în secolele IX–XI* (Cluj/Napoca: Argonaut, 2006).
- 200 Barbu Cămpina, “L’influence byzantine sur le Bas-Danube, à la lumière des recherches récentes effectuées en Roumanie,” *RRH* (1962), no. 1, 10–2; Ștefan Ștefănescu, “Rumyno-bolgarskiye svyazi v IX–XIV vv. i stanovleniye rumynskoy gosudarstvennosti,” 534–6.
- 201 Bănescu, “Ein ethnographisches Problem am Unterlauf der Dunau,” 297–9, 306–7; Ștefănescu, “Rumyno-bolgarskiye svyazi v IX–XIV vv. i stanovleniye rumynskoy gosudarstvennosti,” 538–9; “Peti mezhdunaroden Kongres na slavistite i uchastieto na istoritsite v nego,” *IstPreg* (1963), no. 6, 7–8; Ștefan Ștefănescu, “Reconstitution de la vie d’Etat sur le territoire de la Roumanie au cours du Haut Moyen Age,” *RRH* (1970), no. 1, 10–11; Alexandru Savu, Petre Diaconu and Radu Popa, “Soprotivleniye rumyn vtorzheniyam pereselyavshikhsya narodov,” *Rumyniya. Stranitsy istorii* (1985), no. 4, 92.
- 202 Boris Primov, “Sūzdavaneto na Vtorata bŭlgarska dŭrzhava i uchastieto na vlasite,” in *Bŭlgaro-rumŭnski vrŭzki i otnosheniya prez vekovete. Izsledvaniya*, vol. 1, (XII–XIX v.), ed. Dimitŭr Angelov (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bŭlgarskata akademiya na naukite, 1965), 10–1; Nicolae-Șerban Tanașoca, “Din nou despre geneza și caracterul statului Asăneștilor,” *RdI* (1981), no. 7, 1297–312; Mikhail V. Bibikov, “Bolgariya, Rus’, Vizantiya, polovtsy v sisteme mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniy v Yugo-Vostochnoy Yevrope XII – pervoy poloviny XIII vv.,” 100–1.
- 203 Necșulescu, “Ipoteza formațiunilor politice române la Dunăre în sec. XI.”
- 204 About Barbu Cămpina, see: Bogdan Iacob, “Co-Option and Control: The Changing Profile of the Historical Front in Communist Romania at the End of the Fifties,” *History of Communism in Europe* (2011), no. 2 (Avatars of Intellectuals under Communism), 215–6.

of Byzantium's relations with the region.<sup>205</sup> In his view, despite the Byzantine military presence, for a long time during the 10th to 12th centuries the Lower Danubian lands retained political autonomy, and the chief role in its preservation belonged to the local Romanian population.<sup>206</sup> Ștefan Ștefănescu, a long-time director of the Bucharest Institute of History, endorsed Cămpina's theory and expressed the official view in articles published in 1963, 1970, and 1983.<sup>207</sup> Constantin C. Giurescu, member of the Academy of Sciences of Romania, took a similar position.<sup>208</sup>

Ștefan Olteanu also studied the early era of Romanian statehood,<sup>209</sup> which he saw as the central problem of Romanian medieval studies.<sup>210</sup> In the article “Evolution of the Process of State Organization North and South of the Carpathians in the 9th to 14th Centuries,” he developed a periodization of the emergence of Romanian political entities in the region and created a map of Romanian settlements during that era.<sup>211</sup> Interestingly, the highest concentration of population could be found, according to Olteanu, in the areas that Diaconu had “fenced off” from prolonged nomadic presence – namely in Dobruja between the Teleorman and Ialomița Rivers.<sup>212</sup> In “Trade in the Territories of Moldova and the Principality of Wallachia in the 10th to 14th Centuries,” Olteanu, eager to prove the existence of strong ties between the local population and Byzantium, claimed the entirety of the finds of

205 Barbu Cămpina, “L'influence byzantine sur le Bas-Danube, à la lumière des recherches récentes effectuées en Roumanie,” *RRH* (1962), no. 1, 10–8; Idem, “Influența bizantină la Dunareă de Jos în lumina recentelor cercetări efectuate în România,” in *Scrieri istorice*, vol. 1, eds. Damaschin Mioc and Eugen Stănescu (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1973), 16–22.

206 Cămpina, “L'influence byzantine sur le Bas-Danube,” 14–8.

207 Ștefănescu, “Rumyno-bolgarskiye svyazi v IX–XIV vv. i stanovleniye rumynskoy gosudarstvennosti,” 532–9; Idem, “Reconstitution de la vie d'Etat sur le territoire de la Roumanie au cours du Haut Moyen Age,” 10–2; Idem, “La Tradition daco-romaine et la formation des Etats roumains indépendants (XIe–XIVe ss.),” *Roumanie. Pages d'histoire* (1983), no. 4, 97–112.

208 Constantin C. Giurescu, *Tîrguri sau orașe și cetăți moldovene din secolul al X-lea pînă la mijlocul secolului al XVI-lea*. (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 1967); Idem, *Nomadic Populations in the Euro-Asian Area and Part They Played in the in the Formation of Medieval States. XIV International Congress of Historical Sciences, San-Francisco, août 22-29* (San-Francisco: International Congress of Historical Sciences, 1975).

209 Ștefan Olteanu, “Evoluția procesului de organizare statală la Est și Sud de Carpați în secolele IX–XIV,” *SRDI* (1971), no. 4, 757–76; Idem, “Structuri teritorial-politice românești în spațiul carpato-danubiano-pontic în secolele VIII–XI,” *Rdl* (1979), no. 2, 285–308.

210 Idem, “Probleme prioritare ale evului mediu timpuriu Românesc,” *SRDI* (1973), no. 4, 679.

211 Idem, “Evoluția procesului de organizare statală la Est și Sud de Carpați în secolele IX–XIV.” Image 1.

212 Ibid.

Byzantine coins in these lands for Romanians, despite the evidence that nomads were present there as well.<sup>213</sup> At the same time, in his articles on the demographic makeup of Transylvania in the 8th to 10th centuries he stressed that the population of the region in the 10th century was made up of Slavs, Pechenegs, and Romance-speakers.<sup>214</sup> One of his works was devoted to the coexistence of farming communities and “migratory peoples” during the 4th to 11th centuries.<sup>215</sup>

Byzantinologist Eugen Stănescu studied the administrative organization<sup>216</sup> and ethnic composition of Byzantium’s Danubian lands in the 10th to 12th centuries.<sup>217</sup> At the International Congress of Byzantine Studies in Ohrid,

- 
- 213 Idem, “Comerțul pe teritoriul Moldovei și Țării Românești în secolele X–XV,” *SRdI* (1969), no. 5, 853–5. Niculescu, “Nationalism and the representation of Society in Romanian Archaeology,” 223: “The local population monopolizes the contacts with the civilized Empire.”
- 214 Ștefan Olteanu, “Realități Demografice pe teritoriul Transilvaniei în secolele VIII–X,” *RdI* (1975), no. 12, 1845.
- 215 Idem, “Contribuții la cunoașterea evoluției principalelor unelte agricole pe teritoriul României în epoca marilor migrații (secolele IV–XI e.n.),” *RdI* (1989), no. 3, 273–88.
- 216 Dimităr Angelov, “Kongresüt na vizantolozite v Okhrid,” *IstPreg* (1961), no. 6, 121; Eugen Stănescu, “Beiträge zur Paristrion-Frage. Die Benennungen der unteren Donaugebiete im 10 bis 12 Jahrhundert als historisches Problem,” *JÖB* 17 (1968), 41–64; Idem, “Denumirile bizantine ale regiunii de la Dunărea de Jos în secolele X–XII și sensul lor istoric,” *SCIV* 19 (1968), no. 3, 490–1. A number of important studies dealing with the administration of the Byzantine possessions on the Lower Danube in the 10th to 13th centuries were published by Milan Pavel Šesan (1910–81): Milan Šesan, “Über die byzantinische Anwesenheit an der Unter-Donau im 10. bis 13. Jahrhundert,” in *Actes du XVe Congrès International des Études Byzantines. Athènes. Septembre 1976*, vol. 4, *Histoire. Communications* (Athens: Association Internationale des Études Byzantines, 1980), 275–82; Idem, “Les thèmes byzantins à l’époque des Comnènes et des Anges (1081–1204),” *RÉSEE* 16 (1978), no. 1, 45–5; Idem, “Byzantinische Präsenz an der unteren Donau im 10. bis 13. Jahrhundert,” in *Byzanz in der Europäischen Staatenwelt*, eds. Jürgen Dummer and Johannes Irmscher (Berliner byzantinistische Arbeiten, 49) (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1983), 165–70. In Romania, Vasile Mărculeț is currently working on this problem: Vasile Mărculeț, “Noi considerații asupra organizării, funcționării și rolului themei Mesopotamia Apusului, 971–c. 1000,” *Pontica* 39 (2006), 295–317; Idem, “Ofensiva bulgară de la sfârșitul secolului al X-lea și situația stăpânilor bizantine de la Dunărea de Jos,” *Buridava* 10 (2012), 117–25; Idem, “Revenirea bizantină la Dunărea de Jos 1000–1018/1020,” *Sargetia. Acta Musei Devensis* 3 (2012), 183–90.
- 217 Eugen Stănescu, “Les ‘Mixobarbares’ du Bas-Danube au XIe siècle. (Quelques problèmes de la terminologie des textes),” in *Nouvelles études d’histoire*, vol. 3, *Publiées à l’occasion du XIIe Congrès des Sciences historiques, Vienne* (Bucharest: Editions de l’Académie de la République socialiste de Roumanie, 1965), 45–53; Idem, “La crise du Bas-Danube byzantin au cours de la seconde moitié du XIe siècle,” *ZRVI* 9 (1966), 49–73; Idem, “Byzantinovlachica, I. Les Vlaques à la fin du Xe siècle–début du XIe et la restauration de la domination byzantine dans la Péninsule Balcanique,” *RÉSEE* 6 (1968), no. 3, 407–38;

he delivered a paper on “Byzantine Diplomacy and the 11th-Century Crisis on the Lower Danube.”<sup>218</sup> For the 12th Congress of Historical Sciences in Vienna in 1965, he prepared a paper on “The ‘Mixobarbarians’ of the Lower Danube in the 11th Century: Some Problems of Textual Terminology.”<sup>219</sup> Analyzing the ethnic names used by Greek authors writing about the events of the 11th century, he concluded that the *μιξοβάρβαροι* of Anna Komnene and Michael Attaleiates, as well as the “Vlachs,” “Dacians,” and “Getae” of these and other sources should be understood as Romanians.<sup>220</sup> In the same article, he observed that it was the destabilization caused by the Pecheneg and Uz invasions of 1048–65 that led to the dismantling of Byzantine power in the region and facilitated the emergence of early forms of statehood in Paristrion – later liquidated by Alexios I Komnenos immediately following the defeat of the Pechenegs in 1091.<sup>221</sup> Stănescu reiterated this thought in his programmatic article “Byzantium and the Romanian Lands in the 9th to 14th Centuries.”<sup>222</sup>

A model conveniently fitting the general tenor of Romanian medieval studies was gradually emerging: nomads tore down the Byzantine power on the Lower Danube and more or less receded into the shadows, while the autochthonous (mostly Romanian) population entered the historical arena and, taking advantage of the circumstances, began to form political structures of its own. Stănescu elaborated on this scheme in his general survey of “The Vlachs of the Late 10th and Early 11th Centuries and the Restoration of Byzantine Rule in the Balkan Peninsula.” He argued that the Romanians showed considerable activity even during the previous period of instability before the fall of the First Bulgarian Empire,<sup>223</sup> and that the Pecheneg invasions of the Lower Danubian

---

Idem, “Les ‘Βλάχοι’ de Kinnamos et Choniates et la présence militaire byzantine au nord du Danube sous les Comnènes,” *RÉSEE* 9 (1971), no. 3, 585–93.

218 Angelov, “Kongresüt na vizantolozite v Okhrid,” 121.

219 Stănescu, “Les ‘Mixobarbares’ du Bas-Danube au XIe siècle.”

220 Ibid., 50–1. In this “ethnic” interpretation of the term *μιξοβάρβαροι*, we may detect the influence of Bănescu’s theory that they were “sind, logischerweise nur die Nachkommen römischer Kolonisten aus diesem, der Kolonisation stark ausgesetzten Gebiete sein konnten,” that is, the ancestors of the Romanians: Bănescu, “Ein ethnographisches Problem am Unterlauf der Dunau,” 302.

221 Stănescu, “Les ‘Mixobarbares’ du Bas-Danube au XIe siècle,” 48. See also: Răzvan Theodorescu, *Bizanț, Balcani, Occident la începuturile culturii medievale Românești (secolele X–XIV)* (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1974), 53–4; Alexandru Madgearu, “Observații asupra revoltei din Paradunavon din 1072–1091,” in *Istorie și ideologie. Omagiu profesorului Stelian Brezeanu la 60 de ani*, ed. Manuela Dobre (Bucharest: Editura Universității din București, 2002), 34–46.

222 Eugen Stănescu, “Byzance et les pays Roumains aux IXe–XVe siècles,” in *Actes du XIVe Congrès*, 1, 397–406.

223 Idem, “Byzantinovlachica, I,” 407–32.

Plain caused Romanian population movement, including southward migration across the Danube.<sup>224</sup>

Thus, in “clearing” Wallachia and Dobruja of Pechenegs, Diaconu consciously or unconsciously followed the prevailing trend in Romanian historiography. Diaconu’s work certainly stimulated interest in nomadic subjects. In 1971, Mihai Sâmpetru and Done Șerbănescu described in detail a nomadic grave accidentally found during work on a 4th-century cultural layer. They followed Diaconu’s approach in dating the find<sup>225</sup> and relied heavily on Soviet archaeological scholarship.<sup>226</sup> Sâmpetru’s later overview of “Pecheneg Burials in the Lower Danubian Plain” was strongly influenced by Fyodorov-Davydov’s *Nomads of Eastern Europe under the Rule of the Khans of the Golden Horde*. He also drew on the dissertation of the Moldavian archaeologist Georgii Chebotarenko.<sup>227</sup> Sâmpetru subsequently wrote a separate piece on the Pechenegs’ dealings with the local population.<sup>228</sup> Alexandru Suceveanu attributed the finds at Istria to the Pechenegs.<sup>229</sup> Ioana Popovici described a nomadic burial found at Dinogetia.<sup>230</sup> In 1974, Victor Spinei published one of his first nomad-related articles – on archaeological discoveries in Moldavia.<sup>231</sup>

224 Ibid., 437.

225 Mihai Sâmpetru and Done Șerbănescu, “Mormîntul de călăreț nomad descoperit la Curcani (jud. Ilfov),” *SCIV* 22 (1971), no. 3, 454. See also: Laurenția Bibiri, “Date antropologice asupra resturilor scheletice umane descoperite la Curcani-Ilfov,” *SCIV* 22 (1971), no. 3, 457–62; Miecea Șt. Udrescu, “Note asupra resturilor scheletice ale calului descoperit în mormântul unui călăreț nomad de la Curcani-Ilfov,” *SCIV* 22 (1971), 463–8.

226 In *The Pechenegs on the Lower Danube*, Diaconu mentioned only two works by Soviet archaeologists – Artamonov’s *History of the Khazars* and a little-known article by Georgii Fyodorov. In the later book on the Cumans, on the other hand, he made extensive use of the works of German Fyodorov-Davydov and Svetlana Pletnyova (Diaconu, *Les Coumans*, 19). He may have done so under the influence of Sâmpetru’s writings, even though Diaconu had met Pletnyova while still a junior fellow at the Institute of Archaeology in 1961, when both of them visited the Archaeological Institute and Museum at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences as members of their countries’ delegations: “Pregled,” *Arkheologiya* (1961), no. 4, 76. In 1965, Diaconu published a review of her book: Petre Diaconu, “[Review of:] S. A. Pletneva, *Srednevekovaja keramika Tamanskogo gorodišča*, Moscova, 1963,” *SCIV* 16 (1965), no. 4, 864.

227 Mihai Sâmpetru, “Înmormîntări pecenege din Cîmpia Dunării,” *SCIV* 24 (1973) no. 3, 443–69.

228 Idem, “La région du Bas-Danube au Xe siècle de notre ère,” *Dacia* 18 (1974), 239–64.

229 Alexandru Suceveanu, “Un mormînt din secolul XI e.n. la Histria,” *SCIV* 24 (1973), no. 3, 500.

230 Ioana Popovici, “Nouvelles données anthropologiques concernant la population de Dinogetia (X–XII siècles),” *Annuaire Roumain d’Anthropologie* 9 (1972), 52.

231 Victor Spinei, “Antichitățile nomazilor turanici din Moldova în primul sfert al mileniului al II-lea,” *SCIVA* 25 (1974), no. 3, 389–416.

In Diaconu's book *The Cumans on the Lower Danube*, he reinterpreted as Cuman almost all of the burials previously treated by Sâmpetru as Pecheneg,<sup>232</sup> citing the discussion between Pletnyova and Fyodorov-Davydov.<sup>233</sup> Of the same length as the monograph on the Pechenegs, this new work came out eight years later. Departing somewhat from a strictly chronological presentation of the material, Diaconu began with such issues as the origins and occupations of the Cumans,<sup>234</sup> their socio-economic interactions with the Romanian population,<sup>235</sup> and relics of their presence in the region – archaeological<sup>236</sup> and toponymic.<sup>237</sup>

Taking into account that the period of Alexios I Komnenos' rule in general and the late 11th-century Cuman invasions of Byzantium in particular had already been dealt with quite thoroughly in the work of Vasilievskii, Zlatarski, and Chalandon, Diaconu did not set out to make any revolutionary discoveries in the absence of substantially new source evidence. He did, however, propose several original hypotheses and make some clarifications, enriching the historiography of the problem.<sup>238</sup> For instance, he offered the following conclusions regarding the last Cuman campaign against Byzantium in the 11th century: 1) it began in the autumn of 1094, not in 1095, as most historians had believed,<sup>239</sup>

232 Diaconu, *Les Coumans*, 14–9.

233 *Ibid.*, 19–21.

234 *Ibid.*, 9–13.

235 *Ibid.*, 22–5.

236 *Ibid.*, 14–21. See also his articles: Gheorghe Diaconu and Petre Diaconu, “Un mormînt călăreț nomad de secolele XI–XII descoperit la Movilița (r. Urziceni, reg. București),” *SCIVA* 18 (1967), no. 1, 135–40; Petre Diaconu, “Despre datarea nivelului ‘locuințelor incendiate’ de la Dinoeția-Garvăn (jud Tulcea),” *SCIVA* 26 (1975), no. 3, 387–94.

237 Diaconu, *Les Coumans*, 26–34. In June 1972 in Bucharest, Diaconu participated in a symposium on problems of toponymics with a paper on the toponymy of the Lower Danube: I. Constantinescu, “Simpozion de toponimie,” *SRdI* (1972), no. 5, 1055–7.

238 As pointed out by Silvia Baraschi, Diaconu's chief contribution lay in filling the gap in Romanian historiography concerning the history of the presence of Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans on the Lower Danube: Silvia Baraschi, “[Review of:] Diaconu P., *Les Coumans au Bas-Danube aux XIe et XIIe siècles*, Bucarest, Editura Academiei, 1978, 158 p.,” *RÉSEE* 17 (1979), no. 4, 821. Reviews of the book were published by the Orientalist Peter B. Golden and Byzantinologist Paul Gautier: Peter B. Golden in *The American Historical Review* (1980), no. 2, 380; Paul Gautier in *RÉB* 38 (1980), 307–8.

239 In his defense of dating it to 1095, Paul Gautier offers only one serious argument – the construction of fortifications at Nicomedia in that year. His idea that the Pechenegs were sedentary and Cumans, on the other hand, led a nomadic lifestyle, and therefore could not wage war in winter, seems questionable (Paul Gautier, “Le synode des Blachernes (fin 1094). Etude prosopographique,” *RÉB* 29 (1971), 283). Mănucu-Adameșteanu also favors 1095: Gheorghe Mănucu-Adameșteanu, “Din nou despre atacul cumaniilor din anul 1095 și încetarea locuirii de la Păcuiul lui Soare,” in *Simpozion de numismatică*

2) the Cumans crossed the Danube not in Northern Dobruja but somewhere near Dorostolon; 3) the fortress of Păcuiul lui Soare was destroyed during this campaign; 4) in the late 1080s to early 1090s, the territories along the Danube were controlled by the Byzantines; 5) Vlachs were a constituent part of the population inhabiting the lands between the Danube and the Balkans in this period.<sup>240</sup> The scholar made an interesting observation concerning the statement by a Rus' chronicler under the year 1116 that mentions a campaign by "Prince Leon ... against Alexei the Caesar,"<sup>241</sup> during which two envoys sent by the emperor treacherously murdered Leon. In Diaconu's view, the chronicler here blends together the events of 1094 and 1114, when the Cumans launched another campaign against Byzantium.<sup>242</sup> Diaconu saw the Cumans, rather than Pechenegs, as Byzantium's opponent in the conflict between the trans-Danubian steppe-dwellers and the empire in 1122.<sup>243</sup>

After *The Cumans on the Lower Danube*, Diaconu returned to nomadic subjects a few more times.<sup>244</sup> In 1976 he participated in the 15th International Congress of Byzantine Studies (Athens, 5–11 September)<sup>245</sup> with a paper on "The Material Culture of Dobruja in the 10th to 12th Centuries."<sup>246</sup> In 1977 he gave a talk on the historical geography of Dobruja at a colloquium on the historical geography of Byzantium.<sup>247</sup> He frequently appeared in the pages of academic periodicals as an uncompromising polemicist and demanding reviewer.<sup>248</sup> In 1976, Diaconu began the publication of a series of articles in the *Revistă de Istorie* under the overarching title "History of Dobruja in Latest

---

*dedicat împlinirii a patru secole de la prima unire a românilor sub Mihai Voievod Viteazul, Chișinău, 28-30 mai 2000. Comunicări, studii și note*, ed. Eugen Nicolae (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 2001), 109–20.

240 Diaconu, *Les Coumans*, 58.

241 *Lětopis' po Ipat'jevskomu spisku* (Polnoye Sobranie Russkikh Letopisey, 2) (Saint Petersburg: Tipohrafiya M.A. Aleksandrov, 1908), 204.

242 Diaconu believed that Pseudo-Diogenes was killed by the emperor's envoys in 1094: Diaconu, *Les Coumans*, 60.

243 *Ibid.*, 62–71.

244 Idem, "A propos de l'invasion cumane de 1148," *ÉByz* 1 (1979), 19–27; Idem, "Cumanii și originea familiei lui Dobrotița," *RI* (1993), no. 3–4, 283–8.

245 Tudor Teoteoi, "Le XVe Congrès International d'Études Byzantines (Athènes, 5-11 septembre 1976)," *RRH* (1977), no. 1, 195–8.

246 Petre Diaconu, "A propos de la culture matérielle byzantine du Bas-Danube aux Xe–XIIe siècles," in *Actes du XVe Congrès International des Études Byzantines. Athènes. Septembre 1976*, 4, 97.

247 Stelian Brezeanu, "Colocviul de geografie istorică bizantină," *RdI* (1978), no. 2, 334–5.

248 Petre Diaconu, "Réalités archéologiques et considérations historiques. (Nouveau travail sur les cultures matérielles du Bas-Danube, aux VIIe–Xe siècle)," *RRH* (1966), no. 3, 485–93.



Foreign Works,” in which he mostly polemicized with the views of Bulgarian scholars.<sup>249</sup> His reviews of studies by Ivan Bozhilov<sup>250</sup> and Ivan Ūordanov<sup>251</sup> may be seen as part of the same series. His historiographical essays,<sup>252</sup> popular works,<sup>253</sup> and reviews of primary source editions<sup>254</sup> are also of interest. Furthermore, Diaconu’s work in such areas as attribution of archaeological finds,<sup>255</sup> identification of medieval towns,<sup>256</sup> church history,<sup>257</sup> and history of the Lower Danube lands in general<sup>258</sup> often touched on the problem of Byzantine-nomadic relations. Such specialists in the region’s history as Silvia Baraschi (1942–91)<sup>259</sup> and Oana Damian<sup>260</sup> were his students.

- 
- 249 Idem, “Istoria Dobrogei în unele lucrări străine recente (I),” *RdI* (1976), no. 6, 935–41.
- 250 Idem, “Realități politice la Dunărea de Jos: Români, bizantini, bulgari, pecenegi,” *RdI* (1981), no. 6, 111–33.
- 251 Idem, “S-au emis monede în Dobrogea bizantină (secolele X–XII),” *SCIVA* 32 (1981), no. 3, 407–12; Idem, “Despre organizarea administrativ-militară a regiunii Dunării de Jos în vremea lui Ioan Tzimiskes (Contribuții pe marginea articolului: Sigiliile lui Leon Sarakinopulos de la Preslavul Mare),” *SCIVA* 37 (1986), no. 2, 167–78.
- 252 Lungu, Diaconu and Olteanu, “Le développement de l’historiographie roumaine au cours du dernier quart de siècle,” 774–81; Petre Diaconu, “Quelques problèmes du moyen âge roumain illustrés par les découvertes archéologiques mises au jour après 1945,” *Anuario de estudios medievales* 8 (1972–1973), 567–75.
- 253 Petre Diaconu, “The Petchenegs on the Lower Danube,” in *Relations between the Autochthonous Population*, 235–40; Savu, Diaconu and Popa, “Soprotivleniye rumyn vtorzheniyam pereselyavshikhya narodov.”
- 254 Petre Diaconu, “[Review of:] *Izvori na búlgarskata istoriya*, XV, Sofia, 1972, 321 p.,” *SCIV* 23 (1972), no. 4, 683–4; Idem, “[Review of:] *Ioannis Skylitzes Synopsis historiarum*, recensuit Ioannes Thurn (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, vol. V, Series Berolinensis) Berlin și Novi Eboraci, 1973, 580 p.,” *SCIV* 26 (1975), no. 4, 581–2.
- 255 Petre Diaconu and Petre Năsturel, “Quelques observations sur le complexe archéologique de Murfatlar (Basarabi),” *Dacia* 13 (1969), 448–56.
- 256 Petre Diaconu, “Autor de la localisation de la Petite Preslav,” *RÉSEE* 3 (1965), no. 1–2, 37–65; Idem, “Iarăși despre localizarea Vicinei,” *RdI* (1981), no. 12, 2311–6; Idem, “Kilia et Licostomo ou Kilia = Licostomo,” *RRH* (1986), no. 4, 301–17.
- 257 Idem, “Despre organizarea ecleziastică a regiunii Dunării de Jos (ultima treime a secolului X–secolul XII),” *Studii teologice* 42 (1990), no. 1, 103–20; Idem, “Points de vue sur l’organisation ecclésiastique au Bas-Danube (Xe–XIe s.),” *Dacia* 38–39 (1994–1995), 449–52.
- 258 Idem, “Sur l’histoire de la Dobroudja au Moyen Age,” *Dacia* 32, 1988, 175–94; Idem, “Sur le présence des Byzantins au Bas-Danube (IXe–XIVe siècles),” *RÉSEE* 32 (1994), no. 3–4, 367–73.
- 259 For a sketch of Baraschi’s life and bibliography of her works, see an obituary by Petre Diaconu, “Silvia Baraschi (1942–1991),” *SCIVA* 35 (1991), no. 3–4, 109–12.
- 260 Oana Damian defended a dissertation in 1998 on “Byzantium on the Lower Danube in the 7th to 10th Centuries” based on the materials of the archaeological excavations at Dervent, Nufăru, Hârșova, Păciuil lui Soare, and other sites: Oana Damian, *Bizanțul la Dunărea de Jos: (secolele VII–X)* (Brăila: Editura Istros a Muzeului Brăilei “Carol I,” 2005).

Diaconu and a number of other scholars focused on the antiquities of the Lower Danube, mostly Dobruja. However, relics of nomadic presence are also found in Transylvania,<sup>261</sup> Banat,<sup>262</sup> Wallachia,<sup>263</sup> and Moldova. The regional center of Romanian (Western) Moldova is the city of Iași. It is home to Alexandru Ioan Cuza University and the Alexandru Dimitrie Xenopol Institute of History, the archaeological section of which split off in 1990 to become the Iași Institute of Archaeology.<sup>264</sup> The life and work of a number of prominent historians and archaeologists has been associated with Iași, including Constantin Cihodaru (1907–94),<sup>265</sup> Mircea Petrescu-Dâmbovița (1915–2013), Dan Gh. Teodor (director of the Institute of Archaeology in 1990–2003), and Victor Spinei (served as director of the Institute in 2003–11).

In several of his early articles, Spinei addressed a variety of topics relating to the problem of the participation of North Pontic nomads in trade relations

- 
- 261 See, for instance, Alexandru Madgearu, “Români și Pecenegi în Sudul Transilvaniei,” in *Relații interetnice în Transilvania (secolele VI–XIII)*, eds. Zeno Karl Pinter et al. (Bucharest: Editura Economică, 2005), 111–120; *Cronica cercetărilor arheologice din România. Campania 2006. A Xli-a sesiune Națională de rapoarte arheologice. Tulcea, 29 Mai–1 Iunie 2006*, eds. Mircea Victor Angelescu and Florela Vasilescu (Bucharest: CIMEC – Institutul de Memorie Culturală, 2007), 256.
- 262 Silviu Oța, “Populații nomade de stepă din Banat (secolele XI–XIV). Pecenegii și cumanii,” in *Prinos lui Petre Diaconu*, 489–520.
- 263 Spinei, *The Romanians and the Turkic Nomads*, 349; Emilia Corbu, “Historical and Archaeological Evidences about the Patzinakai’s Presence to the Lower Danube,” in *Kul’tury stepy Yevrazii vtoroy poloviny I tysyacheletiya n.e. Tezisy dokladov IV Mezhdunarodnoy arheologicheskoy konferentsii* (Samara: Samarskiy oblastnoy istoriko-krayevedcheskiy muzey im. P.V. Alabina, 2008), 45–7.
- 264 One of the reasons for the establishment of a separate archaeological institute in Iași was the impressive scale of the local scholars’ research activities. Since 1961, the Iași archaeological community has put out 40 volumes of the journal *Arheologia Moldovei* and approximately 30 monographic studies in the series *Bibliotheca Archaeologica Iassiensis*. In 2005–07, several more series of publications were initiated, such as *Bibliotheca Archaeologica Moldaviae*, *Honoraria*, *Florilegium magistrorum historiae archaeologiaeque Antiquitatis et Medii Aevi*, and others.
- 265 Cihodaru published numerous works focusing on the problems of primary source interpretation: Constantin Cihodaru, “Date istorice și toponimice privind existența populației romanice din regiunea carpato-dunăreana în sec. III–XI,” *Analele științifice ale Universității “Al. I. Cuza”, Iași. Istorie* 15 (1969), no. 1, 1–19; Idem, “Există știri despre Români în operele unor scootori afgani sau persani din secolele X–XI,” *Analele științifice ale Universității “Al. I. Cuza” din Iași. Istorie* 15 (1969), no. 2, 157–70; Idem, “Informații despre Pecenegi din opera lui Constantin Porhrogenetos,” *Analele Științifice ale Universității “Al. I. Cuza” din Iași. Istorie* 20 (1974), no. 1, 17–30.

in the region from the 10th to 13th centuries.<sup>266</sup> He also analyzed late-nomadic finds in Todireni,<sup>267</sup> proposed to reinterpret the testimony of *The Saga of St. Olaf* echoing a joint campaign against steppe-dwellers by a Byzantine emperor with the participation of Varangians and other Western troops,<sup>268</sup> surveyed the late-nomadic archaeological remains in Moldova,<sup>269</sup> and attempted a systematic consideration of the problem of multilateral contacts in the region.<sup>270</sup> Spinei's extensive use of written<sup>271</sup> and numismatic<sup>272</sup> sources and his deep engagement with the historiography of the issues he works on<sup>273</sup> has allowed him to move beyond narrowly archaeological specialization and develop a more

- 
- 266 Spinei, “Unele probleme privind vasele sferoconice,” *SCIV* 21 (1970), no. 2, 264.
- 267 Idem, “Découvertes de l'étape tardive des migrations à Todireni (dép. de Botoșani),” *Dacia* 17 (1973), 277–92. This article was possibly the first study to draw attention to the leaf-shaped and “rectangular” amulets, which are now considered markers of the Pechenegs.
- 268 Idem, “Informații despre Vlăhi în izvoarele medievale nordice. I,” *SCIV* 24 (1973), no. 1, 57–81; “Informații despre Vlăhi în izvoarele medievale nordice. II” in *SCIV* 24 (1973), no. 2, 259–82.
- 269 Idem, “Antichitățile nomazilor turanici din Moldova în primul sfert al mileniului al III-lea,” *SCIVA* 25 (1974), no. 3, 389–415.
- 270 Idem, “Les relations de la Moldavie avec Byzance et la Russie au premier quart du II<sup>e</sup> millénaire à la lumière des sources archéologiques,” *Dacia* 19 (1975), 227–42; Idem, “Relations of the Local Population of Moldavia with the Nomad Turanian Tribes in the 10th–13th Centuries,” in *Relations between the Autochthonous Population*, 265–76. In 1977, Spinei defended a doctoral dissertation on Moldova in the 11th to 14th centuries. It was published as a book in 1982, went through several editions, and was translated into English: Idem, *Moldova în secolele XI–XIV* (Bucharest: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1982); Idem, *Moldavia in the 11th–14th Centuries* (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1986). Reviews: Eric Ditmar Tappe, in *SEER* 65 (1987), no. 4, 665; Jean Darrouzès, in *RÉB* 46 (1988), 270–1.
- 271 See, for instance, Victor Spinei, “Realitățile etnico-politice de la Dunărea de Jos în secolele XI–XII în cronică lui Mihail Sirianul, I,” *RdI* 36 (1983), no. 10, 989–1007; Idem, “Realitățile etnico-politice de la Dunărea de Jos în secolele XI–XII în cronică lui Mihail Sirianul, II,” *RdI* 37, 1984, no. 2, 126–48.
- 272 Idem, “Monede bizantine din spațiul est-carpatic,” *Studii și cercetări numismatice* 8 (1984), 77–83.
- 273 Spinei authored a few historiographical works; see, for example, Idem, “‘Chestiunea Dunării’ în cadrul creației istoriografice a lui N. Iorga,” în Nicolae Iorga, *Chestiunea Dunării* (Iași, 1998), 5–75. He also kept abreast of foreign scholarship. For instance, in the article “Antichitățile nomazilor turanici din Moldova în primul sfert al mileniului al III-lea” Spinei drew on the works of Ivan Bozhilov, Árpád Nagy, Svetlana Pletnyova, Georgiy Fyodorov, German Fyodorov-Davydov, and others. At the time when in Soviet Moldavia and Ukraine interest in late nomadic archaeological remains in the Dniester-Prut region was only emerging, Spinei was already making extensive use of the accomplishments of Soviet archaeologists in his work with “nomadic” finds in Western Moldavia.

comprehensive view of the web of intercultural contacts in the Eastern Carpathian region, as evidenced by a number of his articles<sup>274</sup> and books.<sup>275</sup>

Overall, in his work Spinei follows the basic tenets of Romanian historiography. He stresses the permanent presence of Romanians along the Danube and their activities in the creation of political entities and denies that any external agents, such as the First Bulgarian Empire, Byzantium, Rus', or the Cumans, had control over the Romanian population.<sup>276</sup> On the other hand, beginning with his first articles written under the regime of Nicolae Ceaușescu, Spinei has been emphasizing that there was interaction and mutual influence between the settled and nomadic populations in the region.<sup>277</sup>

- 274 Idem, "La Bucovine à l'époque des grandes migrations et au Moyen Âge," *Dacia* 38–39 (1994–1995), 365–88; Idem, "Aspecte controversate ale contactelor românilor cu turanicii în secolele X–XIII," *Arheologia Moldovei* 19 (1996), 271–9; Idem, "Generalități privind nomadismul evestru în extremitatea vestică a Eurasiei în secolele IX–XIII," *Arheologia Moldovei* 27 (2004), 97–132; Idem, "The Cumanic Bishopric – Genesis and Evolution," in *The Other Europe*, 413–56.
- 275 Idem, *Realități etnice și politice în Moldova Meridională în secolele X–XIII. Români și turanici* (Iași: Editura Junimea, 1985). Review: Luminița Fassel, in *sof* 46 (1987), 290–1; Victor Spinei, *Ultimele valuri migratoare de la nordul Mării Negre și al Dunării de Jos* (Iași: Editura Helios, 1996). In English: *The Great Migrations in the East and South East of Europe from the the Ninth to the Thirteenth Century, I, Hungarians, Pechenegs and Uzes* (Amsterdam: Hakker, 2006). Review: Charles J. Halperin, in *AEMAE* 14 (2005), 299–302; Spinei, *The Romanians and the Turkic Nomads*. International reviews: Nora Berend, in *The Medieval Review*, 11.03.14, Bloomington, Indiana, 2011. Available at <https://scholarworks.iu.edu/journals/index.php/tmr/article/view/17182>. Accessed on 10 January 2022; Andrei Timotin, in *RÉSEE* 49 (2011), 360–1; Kiril Petkov, in *Speculum* 86 (2011), no. 2, 554–6; Dan Shapira, in *AEMAE* 18 (2011), 357–60; Daniel Ziemann, in *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 68 (2012), no. 1, 419–20. Twice, in 1995 and 2001, Spinei served as a Summer Fellow with the Byzantine Studies Program at Dumbarton Oaks, where he worked on the projects "The Byzantine Pottery from the Lower Danube in the 10th–14th Centuries" and "The Cumans and Their Contacts with Southeastern European Peoples in the 11th–14th Centuries."
- 276 See, for instance, Victor Spinei, "Les relations de la Moldavie avec Byzance et la Russie au premier quart du IIe millénaire à la lumière des sources archéologiques," *Dacia* 19 (1975), 235–41; Idem, *The Romanians and the Turkic Nomads*, 60–1, 137–8, 140. See also the above-mentioned scathing review by Nora Berend in *The Medieval Review*.
- 277 Idem, "Relations of the Local Population of Moldavia with the Nomad Turanian Tribes in the 10th–13th Centuries," 271–3. Perhaps we should see in this an influence of the ideas of Iorga, voiced in the article "Imperiul Cumanilor și domnia lui Bășărabă. Un capitol din colaborația româno-barbară în Evul Mediu." Either way, this tendency continues in Romanian historiography. Thus, Madgearu insists on the Pecheneg origin of the name of the first ruler of Wallachia, Basarab, and believes that the Pechenegs settled in Banat by the Hungarians relocated there under Cuman pressure from lands populated by Romanians, which is evidenced by the "non-Hungarian" form of their name – Peceneği (instead of Besenyő/Bisseni): Madgearu, "Români și peceneği în sudul Transilvaniei,"

Nomadic burials in Romania have also been studied by Valeriu Leahu, Georghe Trohani, Florian Anastasiu, Nicolae Harțușe, Adrian Bejan, and Mircea Mare.<sup>278</sup> Mihalache Brudiu, an archaeologist based at Galați University, has written on nomadic burial complexes in Moldova.<sup>279</sup> Silviu Oța of the Romanian National History Museum studies burials, jewelry, weapons, and other archaeological materials from Banat that may be attributed to 10th- to 14th-century nomads<sup>280</sup> and analyses various cultural influences in the region.<sup>281</sup> Using formal statistical methods, Adrian Ioniță of the Vasile Pârvan Institute of Archaeology has attempted to systematize nomadic burials north of the Danube<sup>282</sup> and to model the structure of the area's population based on burial materials.<sup>283</sup> Slobozia-based scholar Emilia Corbu in 2008 identified only seven places along the Lower Danube where characteristically Pecheneg burials were found: Buzău, Brăila, Ialomița, Călărași, Lacul Tei (Bucharest),

- 
- 11–20. See also: Stelian Brezeanu, “Basarab. O nouă ipoteză asupra originilor antroponimului,” in *Identități și solidarități medievale. Controverse istorice* (Bucharest, 2002), 371–86.
- 278 Valeriu Leahu and Georghe Trohani, “Două norminte de călăreți nomazi din cîmpia Teleormanului,” *SCIVA* 29 (1978), no. 4, 529–40; Florian Anastasiu and Nicolae Harțușe, “Morminte și călăreți nomazi descoperite în județul Brăila,” *ISTROS* 1 (1980), no. 1, 263–80; Adrian Bejan and Mircea Mare, “Dudeștii Vechi-Pusta Bucova, necropola și morminte de inhumație din secolele VI–XII,” in *Analele Banatului. Arheologie, istorie* 6 (1998), 323–38.
- 279 Mihalache Brudiu, “Complexe funerare tumulare din sud-estul Moldovei (I),” *Peuce* 10 (1991), 41–57; Idem, *Lumea de sub tumulii din sudul Moldovei: De la indo-europeni la turanicii târzii. Mărturii arheologice* (Bucharest: Editura Printech, 2003).
- 280 In his view, Pechenegs were present in Banat beginning in the 11th century, while Hungarian burial complexes are characteristic of the 10th century: Silviu Oța, “Populații atestate în Banat în secolele IX–XII surse istorice și problemele arheologice,” *Muzeul Național* 19 (2007), no. 1, 36–7.
- 281 Idem, “Domenii ale pecenegilor și cumanilor în Banatul istoric,” *Studii de Istorie a Banatului* 26–27 (2002–2003), 219–39; Idem, “Populații nomade de stepă din Banat (secolele XI–XIV). Pecenegii și cumani”; Idem, “Pecenegii din Banat. De la comunități militare la statutul nobiliar,” *Apulum* 44 (2007), 315–39; Idem, “Piese de orfevrărie de tradiție bizantină”; Idem, “The Couman Society on the Banat Territory (13th–14th centuries),” in *Tracii și vecinii lor în antichitate. Studia in honorem Valerii Sîrbu*, ed. Ionel Cîndea (Brăila: Istros, 2010), 595–609; *The Mortuary Archaeology of the Medieval Banat (10th–14th Centuries)*, etc.
- 282 Adrian Ioniță, “Morminte de călăreți la nordul Dunării de Jos în sec. X–XIII,” in *Prinos lui Petre Diaconu*, 462–88; Idem, “Observations sur les necropoles planes dans la region comprise entre le Bas-Danube, les Carpates et le Dniestr aux Xe–XIIIe siecles,” *Banatica* 23 (2013), 203–22; Idem, “Observații asupra mormintelor cu depunere de cai sau părți de cai în spațiul cuprins între Dunărea de Jos, Carpați și Nistru, în secolele X–XIII,” in *The Steppe Lands and the World beyond Them*, 115–50.
- 283 Idem, “Structures de pouvoir et populations au Nord du Danube aux Xe–XIIIe siècles reflétées par les découvertes funéraires (Etat actuelle de la recherche et intentions du projet),” in *Transylvanian Review* 19 (2010), Suppl. 5/1, 115–34.

Teleorman, and Constanța.<sup>284</sup> While rare, Turkic nomadic burials of the 10th and 11th centuries continue to be discovered in Romania.<sup>285</sup>

Extremely important for the study of Byzantine-nomadic relations and nomadic presence in the Carpathian-Danubian-Balkan region are Byzantine coins and seals. I should note that both classic and present-day Byzantine studies treat archaeological evidence with caution, very rarely using coin and seal finds as sources. Traditionally, Byzantinologists trust only written testimony.<sup>286</sup> But the latter is scarce and subjective for the period and region in question and there is less and less hope that any new written sources for medieval history will be discovered;<sup>287</sup> on the other hand, new coins and seals turn up across the

284 Corbu, “Historical and Archaeological Evidences about the Patzinakai’s Presence to the Lower Danube,” 45–7. See also her monograph: *Sudul României în Evul Mediu timpuriu (secolele VIII–XI): repere arheologice* (Brăila: Istros, 2006).

285 For instance, the burial at Popina Ruptă (town of Însurăței), found in 1997, and Baba Cave (village of Cheia), discovered in 2008: *Însurăței, Județ: Brăila, Punct: Popina I, Popina Ruptă (II), Anul: 1997*. Available at <http://cronica.cimec.ro/detalii.asp?k=514&d=Insuratei-Braila-Popina-I-Popina-Rupta-Popina-II-1997>. Accessed on 10 January 2022; Bartłomiej-Szymon Szmoniewski and Valentina Voinea, “Pogrebeniye tyurkskogo kochevnika, otkrytoye v peshchere Baba v Sredney Dobrudzhe v Rumynii,” *Stratum Plus* (2011), no. 5, 287–96; Bartłomiej-Szymon Szmoniewski and Valentina Voinea, “Pogrebeniye tyurkskogo kochevnika v peshchere Baba v severnoy Dobrudzhe: svidetel’stvo prisutstviya pechenegov v regione,” in *Istoriya i kul’tura srednevekovykh narodov stepnoy Yevrazii*, ed. Alexei A. Tishkin (Barnaul: Izditel’stvo Altayskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta, 2012), 150–2.

286 Peter Frankopan, director of the Oxford Centre for Byzantine Research, points out that Byzantine folles of the 10th to 11th centuries found in Dobruja are unreliable as dating evidence for historical events, because there exist several different systems of dating their issues. He views Byzantine seals with similar reservations: Frankopan, “The Numismatic Evidence from the Danube Region 971–1092,” 31. Florin Curta, in his review of Paul Stephenson’s book *Byzantium’s Balkan Frontier: A Political Study of the Northern Balkans, 900–1204*, notes that “since the documents they once sealed did not survive, it is impossible to know whether the Preslav seals were attached to original documents or to copies”: Florin Curta, “[Review of:] Paul Stephenson, *Byzantium’s Balkan Frontier. A Political Study of the Northern Balkans, 900–1204*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000,” *Balkan Academic Book Review* (2000), no. 22.

287 Perhaps the last such source is the so-called *Taktikon Escorial*, discovered by Nikos Oikonomidès. On its significance, see Bojana Krsmanović, *The Byzantine province in change: on the threshold between the 10th and the 11th century* (Belgrade/Athens: Institute for Byzantine Studies, Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts/Institute for Byzantine Research, National Hellenic Research Foundation, 2008), 75–82. We can also recall here the almost detective story of the forgery of another source – the *Toparcha Gothicus*.

former Byzantine domains and adjacent lands every year.<sup>288</sup> These materials cannot be ignored any longer.<sup>289</sup>

Romanian numismatics can boast of important accomplishments. As early as 1957, the discipline acquired a periodical of its own – *Studii și Cercetări de Numismatică*, published under the auspices of the Institute of Archaeology at the Academy of Sciences of Romania. The section “Chronicle of Numismatic Discoveries” was a permanent feature in the journals *sciv/sciva* and *Dacia*. The *Buletinul Societății Numismatice Române* (Bulletin of the Romanian Numismatic Section) began coming out in 1972, and in 1978 the National Museum of Romanian History launched the journal *Cercetări Numismatice* (Numismatic Studies). Byzantine numismatics in post-war Romania is associated with the names of Bucur Mitrea, Constantin Preda, Gheorghe Poenaru-Bordea, Eugen Chirilă, Constanța Știrbu, Judith Winkler, Radu Ocheșeanu, and others.

Bucur Mitrea (1909–95) was a participant in the extensive archaeological excavations of the 1950s and 1960s. He was a long-time reviewer of new finds of Byzantine and Roman coins for the journals *Dacia* and *sciv*. His conclusions and expertise were used by Diaconu in the latter’s books on the Pechenegs and Cumans<sup>290</sup> and by Preda in his general survey of Byzantine monetary circulation.<sup>291</sup> Today, students of Byzantine numismatics continue to turn to his work.<sup>292</sup>

288 In the opinion of Sorin Langu, the “large number of Byzantine coins from the Xth–XIIIth centuries ... overlaps an economic revival, which begins in the IXth century”: Sorin Langu, “Aspecte ale circulației monetare între anii 700-971 la sud și est de Carpați,” *Danubius* 23 (2005), 55.

289 See, for instance, Johnatan Shepard, “Mingling with Northern Barbarians: Advantages and Perils,” *The Steppe Lands and the World beyond Them*, 113–5, 121 and 126.

290 Diaconu, *Les Petchénègues au Bas-Danube*, 109; Idem, *Les Coumans*, 52–3, 55, 65, 88, 134–6.

291 Constantin Preda, “Circulația monedelor bizantine în regiunea carpato-dunăreană,” *sciv* 23 (1972), no. 3, 395–412. Preda’s work “Circulation of Byzantine Coins in the Carpathian-Danubian Region” summed up the entire previous history of Byzantine coin discoveries. They were analysed in their historical context and placed into a clear scheme built around the thesis that a Romanian population lived uninterruptedly along the Danube at least since the Roman times and had close ties with Byzantium (which ties were to indicate a high degree of economic and cultural development): Ibid., 413–5; Constantin Preda, “The Byzantine Coins – an Expression of the Relations between the Empire and the Populations North of the Danube in the 6th-13th Centuries,” in *Relations between the Autochthonous Population*, 230–1. He attributed some coin finds to nomads: Ibid., 231; Preda, “Circulația monedelor bizantine în regiunea carpato-dunăreană,” 392. About Constantin Preda, see: Virgil Mihăilescu-Bîrliba, “Constantin Preda (1.11.1925–28.03.2008),” *Arheologia Moldovei* 32 (2009), 417–28.

292 Gheorghe Mănușu-Adameșteanu, “Aspecte ale politicii împăratului Alexios I Comnenul la Dunărea de Jos în lumina ultimelor descoperiri sfragistice și numismatice,” *RI* (1995),

The numismatist and sigillographer Octavian Iliescu<sup>293</sup> (1919–2009) published a fundamental study on *The History of Coins in Romania*.<sup>294</sup> At the 1966 congress of Byzantine studies in Oxford, he delivered a paper on the Byzantine influence in the region of the Lower Danube, based on numismatic finds.<sup>295</sup> His attempt to locate the Byzantine town of Likostomo (Chilia) relied mostly on the same source base.<sup>296</sup> In his “First Manifestations of Alexios I Komnenos’ Currency Reform on the Lower Danube,” Iliescu connects the appearance of new coins in the region with the success of the 1091 and 1094–95 campaigns against nomads.<sup>297</sup>

In an article published in 1997, expressing skepticism about the use of coins and seals to date historical events in the region of the Lower Danube in the late 10th and early 11th centuries, Peter Doimi de Frankopan cited Romanian publications of 1967, 1972, and 1976.<sup>298</sup> Meanwhile, discoveries of new Byzantine seals and especially coins in the region continue to come regularly and overviews of them are routinely published in Romanian and Bulgarian academic periodicals.<sup>299</sup> The accumulation of source material has led to the appearance of catalogs<sup>300</sup> and general works on the history of the region based on numismatic and sigillographic data.<sup>301</sup> Thanks to the efforts of Romanian

---

no. 3–4, 352–4. The most often quoted is Mitrea’s article on “Ancient and Byzantine Coins Found at Păciul lui Soare”: Bucur Mitrea, “Monede antice și bizantine descoperite la Păciul lui Soare,” in Diaconu and Vilceanu, *Păciul lui Soare*, 1, 181–212.

- 293 About him: Ernest Oberländer-Târmoveanu, “Octavian Iliescu (22.08.1919–24.10.2009),” *Arheologia Moldovei* 32 (2009), 434–42.
- 294 Octavian Iliescu, *The History of Coins in Romania (cca. 1500 B.C.–2000 A.D.). Chronology – Bibliography – Glossary* (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 2002).
- 295 Idem, “Cel de-al XII-lea Congres Internațional de studii bizantine Oxford (5-10 septembrie 1966),” *SRdI* (1966), no. 6, 1197.
- 296 Idem, “Localizarea vechiului Licostomo,” *SRdI* (1972), no. 3, 435–65; Idem, “À la recherche de Kilia byzantine,” *RÉSEE* 16 (1978), no. 2, 229–38; Idem, “De nouveau sur Kilia et Licistomo,” *RRH* (1994), no. 1–2, 159–67.
- 297 Idem, “Premières apparitions au Bas-Danube de la monnaie reformée d’Alexis I-er Comnène,” in *Études byzantines et post-byzantines*, 1, 9–18. Preda’s and Iliescu’s works and advice were used by Diaconu in his book on the Cumans: Diaconu, *Les Coumans*, 53, 109, 112–3, 134–7.
- 298 Frankopan, “The Numismatic Evidence from the Danube Region 971–1092,” 31.
- 299 In addition to general archaeological and numismatic journals, these also include periodicals published by regional museums, such as *Pontica* (Constanța), *Peuce* (Tulcea), *INMV*, and others.
- 300 For instance: Gheorghe Mănucu-Adameșteanu, *Monede bizantine descoperite în Dobrogea*, 5 vols (Bucharest: Mistral Info Media, 2010–2017).
- 301 Gabriel Gh. Custurea, *Circulația monedei bizantine în Dobrogea (secolele IX–XI)* (Constanța: Editura Ex Ponto, 2000); Gheorghe Mănucu-Adameșteanu, *Istoria Dobrogei în perioada 969–1204. Contribuții arheologice și numismatice* (Bucharest: Editura Mad



archaeologists and numismatists – Gheorghe Poenaru-Bordea (1937–2004),<sup>302</sup> Victor Henrich Baumann,<sup>303</sup> Oana Damian,<sup>304</sup> Gabriel Custurea,<sup>305</sup> Gabriel Talmățchi, Aurel Stănică, and others – the results of the archaeological work on Byzantine sites in Romania during 1980s–2010s have been coming to light in a steady stream of published scholarship.<sup>306</sup> Of particular importance in the context of the present study are the works of Ernest Oberländer-Târnoveanu and Gheorghe Mănușu-Adameșteanu.

While still working at the Danube Delta Museum in Tulcea, Oberländer-Târnoveanu, now of the National Museum of Romanian History, became interested in the discoveries of Greek and Byzantine coins in the Danube region and published reviews of new finds<sup>307</sup> and, later, general articles on numismatic issues.<sup>308</sup>

---

Linotype, 2001); Oberländer-Târnoveanu, *Monedă și societate pe teritoriile de la Sud și Est de Carpați: (secolele VI–XIV)*.

- 302 Poenaru-Bordea for many years regularly reviewed numismatic finds in Romania. See: Gheorghe Poenaru-Bordea and Bucur Mitrea, “Découvertes monétaires en Roumanie – 1988 (XXXI),” *Dacia* 33 (1989), 215–30; Gheorghe Poenaru-Bordea and Bucur Mitrea, “Découvertes monétaires en Roumanie – 1993 (XXXVII),” *Dacia* 38–39 (1994–1995), 459–78; Gheorghe Poenaru-Bordea, Radu Ocheșeanu and Alexandru Popeea, *Monnaies byzantines du Musée de Constanța (Roumanie)* (Wetteren: Moneta, 2004).
- 303 Gheorghe Poenaru-Bordea and Victor Heinrich Baumann, “Monede romane și bizantine provenite din nordul Dobrogei,” *Peuce* 4 (1973–1975), 133–73.
- 304 Oana Damian, “Repere arheologice privind orașele medievale ale diferitelor zone. Dunărea de Jos,” *Historia Urbana* 13 (2005), no. 1–2, 141–83; Oana Damian and Gabriel Vasile, “Vestigii arheologice descoperite pe dealul Dervent (jud. Constanța),” in *Între stepă și imperiu. Studii în onoarea lui Radu Harhoiu*, eds. Andrei Măgureanu and Erwin Gall (Bucharest: Editura Renaissance, 2010), 337–84.
- 305 Gabriel Gh. Custurea, *Circulația monedei bizantine*; Gabriel Gh. Custurea et al., *Coin Hoards of Dobruđja* (Constanța: Editura Ex Ponto, 2007); Gabriel Gh. Custurea and Gabriel M. Talmățchi, *Repertoriul tezaurilor monetare din Dobrogea* (Constanța: Editura Ex Ponto, 2011).
- 306 For more detailed bibliographies, see the above-mentioned monographs of Custurea, Oberländer-Târnoveanu, and Mănușu-Adameșteanu, as well as Madgearu, *Byzantine Military Organization on the Danube*.
- 307 For instance: Ernest Oberländer-Târnoveanu, “Monede bizantine din secolele VII–X descoperite în nordul Dobrogei,” *Studii și Cercetări de Numismatică* 7 (1980), 163–5; Idem, “Cronica descoperirilor monetare din Nordul Dobrogei,” *Peuce* 7 (1980), 507–11.
- 308 Idem, “Quelques aspects de la circulation monétaire dans la zone de l’Embouchure du Danube au XIIe siècle,” *Dacia* 23 (1979), 265–73; Idem, “Un atelier monétaire byzantin inconnu de la deuxième moitié du XIe siècle dans le thème de Paristrion,” *RÉSEE* 21 (1983), no. 3, 261–70; Idem, “Numismatic and Historical Remarks on the Byzantine Coin Hoards from the 12-th Century at the Lower Danube,” *RÉSEE* 30 (1992), no. 1–2, 41–60; Idem, “The Byzantine Empire and the Territories North of the Lower Danube (9th–Early 11th C.). The Numismatic Evidence,” in *Byzantine Coins in Central Europe between the*

One of the first scholars to draw attention to the fact that a large proportion of coins found in northeastern Bulgaria and Dobruja were different from standard Constantinople issues was the Bulgarian historian Ivan Ĭordanov.<sup>309</sup> Oberländer-Târnoveanu rejected the possibility of large-scale counterfeiting activity. In his view, at least during the years 1068–81, and possibly until 1091, the province of Paristrion boasted a mint of its own, initially located in Dorostolon and after the rebellion of the 1070s removed to Noviodunum. The reason for its creation was the existence in 1072–91 of a political entity hostile to Byzantium in the northeast of Bulgaria (southern section of Dobruja).<sup>310</sup> This hypothesis could explain the reports in written sources about disturbances in the southern part of Paristrion from 1072 to 1091. It gave rise to further research in two directions – regarding the existence in Dobruja of an autonomous mint<sup>311</sup> and an independent political entity, Patzinakia.<sup>312</sup> In an article about hoards of 12th-century Byzantine coins in Dobruja, Oberländer-Târnoveanu linked one such deposit from the village of Kalipetrovo (near Silistra, Bulgaria) with the 1095 Cuman raid on Byzantium.<sup>313</sup> He further argued that the coin finds at Nufăru, described by him, were relics of the Pecheneg incursion of 1122.<sup>314</sup>

In his book *Coins and Society in the Territories South and East of the Carpathians*, Oberländer-Târnoveanu agreed with Diaconu's arguments concerning

---

*5th and 10th Century*, ed. Marcin Wołoszyn (Cracow: Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences, 2009), 561–79.

- 309 Ivan Ĭordanov, "Ranni formi na monetno proizvodstvo (X–XII v.) v bolgarskite zemi," *Numizmatika* 2 (1980), 4–15. However, his take on the issue was not shared by Diaconu: Diaconu, "S-au emis monede în Dobrogea bizantină (secolele X–XII)."
- 310 Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "Un atelier monétaire byzantin," 262, 266, 268–9.
- 311 Gheorghe Mănucu-Adameşteanu, "Un atelier monetar dobrogean din secolul al XI-lea," *Studii și cercetări de numismatică* 12 (1997), 119–49. With some reservations, Mănucu-Adameşteanu sides with the hypothesis about the existence of an autonomous mint. He does note, however, that, if we are to believe archaeological data, the Byzantine rule in the region continued – with the exception of Dorostolon and northeastern Bulgaria: Idem, *Istoria Dobrogei în perioada 969–1204*, 479. Interestingly, the weakening of Constantinople's power in the 1070s had an impact on the Cherson mint as well. Mikhail Choref observes that these years saw the minting of coins with the monogram *πὸλις Χερσωνος*; and in the 1080s, as the imperial authority firmed up, the politically neutral image of the cross on Golgotha returned on local coins: Mikhail M. Choref, *Istoriya vizantiyskoy Tavriki po dannym numizmatiki* (Tyumen: TyumGU, 2015), 105.
- 312 Ivan Ĭordanov, "Sceau d'archonte de PATZINAKIA du XIe siècle," *ÉB* 28 (1992), no. 2, 79–82; Madgearu, "Observații asupra revoltei din Paradunavon din 1072–1091."
- 313 Oberländer-Târnoveanu, "Numismatic and Historical Remarks on the Byzantine Coin Hoards," 42–3.
- 314 Idem, "Monede antice și bizantine descoperite la Nufăru (jud. Tulcea) păstrate în colecția Muzeului Militar Național," *Buletinul Societății Numismatice Române* 88–89 (1994–1995), 81.

the concentration of Tyrach’s Pechenegs in central Muntenia, and possibly the southeastern part of Oltenia before their attack on Byzantium. At the same time, he opposed the idea that the nomads may have stayed in these areas for long stretches of time in 1027–36 and 1048–91.<sup>315</sup> He based this conclusion on the fact that we observe no hoarding of precious-metal coins in the region during these particular periods. Further, Oberländer-Târnoveanu believed that the colonization of the territory of Lovech-Serdica-Nish-Ovče Pole<sup>316</sup> by the Pechenegs created a kind of barrier against the infiltration of Byzantine coins into the adjacent areas north of the Danube, and that during the years 1068–91 nomadic raids and related events worsened the economic situation in the *themes* of Paristrion and Bulgaria.<sup>317</sup>

Gheorghe Mănuclu-Adameşteanu of the Museum of the City of Bucharest had the experience of archaeological fieldwork at Nufăru, Noviodunum, Beroe, Ghiolul Pietrei, and other Byzantine sites. His articles, which greatly expanded the source base for the history of the region, appeared first in the regional journals *Peuce* and *Pontica*, and later in the *MCA*, *RESEE*, *RI*, *SCIVA*, and specialized numismatic publications, as Mănuclu-Adameşteanu progressed from chronicling numismatic finds to rethinking some aspects of the history of the Lower Danube in the 10th to 12th centuries.

Thus, in a piece on “The Spread of Byzantine Coins in Dobruja in the 9th–10th Centuries,” he attempted to illustrate the history of the region (in which the Pechenegs were assigned a role as well) using numismatic data. He argued that the large number of finds of Byzantine gold coins was evidence of Constantinople’s military presence in the region as early as the first half of the 10th century.<sup>318</sup>

Seals found in Dobruja led the researcher to conclude that the *strategos* of Paristrion, Leo Nikeritas, mentioned in the *Alexiad* under 1088, was in charge

315 Idem, *Monedă și societate pe teritoriile de la sud și est de Carpați* (secolele VI–XIV) (Cluj-Napoca: Editura Nereamia Napocae, 2003), 87–8.

316 Skylitzes mentions *Ἐπὶ τὰ πόλεις* (*Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsis historiarum*, ed. Hans Thurn (Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 1973), 459). The interpretation of this name as Ovče Pole (after Zlatarski and Diaconu) has taken root in historiography. See also: Soustal, *Thrakien (Thrakē, Rodopē und Haimimontos)*, 139 and 193.

317 *Monedă și societate pe teritoriile de la sud și est de Carpați* (secolele VI–XIV), 87–91. At the same time, Oberländer-Târnoveanu draws attention to the large number of finds of gold coins in Dobruja, southern Bessarabia, and eastern Muntenia dated between 1148 and 1195 – as hostilities between the Cumans and Byzantium intensified: *Ibid.*, 119.

318 Gheorghe Mănuclu-Adameşteanu, “La diffusion de la monnaie byzantine en Dobroudja aux IXe–Xe siècles,” *RÉSEE* 34 (1996), no. 3–4, 286.

of the region from a very early date.<sup>319</sup> Seals of Alexios I himself and his brother Adrianos, since 1087 commander of the Byzantine army, were found on the Danube in Păcuil lui Soare and Spantov. This, however, did not allow Mănuclu-Adameșteanu to say with certainty whether Anna Komnene's report of the emperor's personal involvement in the fighting against the Pechenegs on the Lower Danube was true.<sup>320</sup> The absence of gold and silver coin finds in Dobruja for the period preceding the monetary reform (1081–92) confirms that, as a consequence of Pecheneg and Cuman raids, the Byzantine hold on Dobruja was extremely weak or even nonexistent for a long time.<sup>321</sup> At the same time, the statistics of copper coin finds indicates that the nomads established a base in the southern part of the region. This was the reason for the severe devastation we observe at Păcuil lui Soare and the abandonment of the town of Hârșova by its inhabitants, while the northern part of the region continued to develop without much disturbance (only Dinogetia was abandoned).<sup>322</sup> The discovery of large quantities of post-reform coins of the Constantinople issues of 1093–95 at Nufăru, Tulcea, Isaccea, Dinogetia, Măcin, and Troesmis illustrates the gradual restoration of imperial control over Dobruja.<sup>323</sup>

In 1999, Mănuclu-Adameșteanu defended a dissertation on “The History of Dobruja in 969–1204: Archaeological and Numismatic Contributions.”<sup>324</sup> Drawing mainly on coin and seal finds, he raised, among others, such questions as whether or not Emperor Ioannes Tzimiskes was able to advance Byzantine rule north of the Danube, which Byzantine fortifications were restored and when, when they were destroyed (in part or completely), and what were the nature and nomenclature of the military-administrative organization of the Byzantine rule on the Lower Danube up until its demise. The author paid special attention to the problems of Pecheneg and Uz invasions and the rebellion of the cities of Paristrion.<sup>325</sup> Regarding the question of chronology,

319 Idem, “Aspecte ale politicii împăratului Alexios I Comnenul la Dunărea de Jos în lumina ultimelor descoperiri sfragistice și numismatice,” *RI* (1995), no. 3–4, 350.

320 Ibid., 349.

321 Ibid., 350.

322 Ibid., 352–6 and 359.

323 Ibid., 357–9. The importance of this article by Mănuclu-Adameșteanu is reinforced by the fact that it includes a general catalog of the finds of Byzantine coins of Alexios I Komnenos in Dobruja (Ibid., 360–7). In 2010, Mănuclu-Adameșteanu began the publication of a catalog of Byzantine coins found in Dobruja: Idem, *Monede bizantine descoperite în Dobrogea*, 1.

324 The work was completed under the supervision of Ion Barnea and published in 2001: Mănuclu-Adameșteanu, *Istoria Dobrogei în perioada 969–1204*.

325 Ibid., 103–22, 125–9, 130–6. Mănuclu-Adameșteanu concluded that the raid of 1027 affected Dervent, Capidava, and Dinogetia, and that those of 1032, 1034, and 1035 mostly bypassed

Mănuclu-Adameşteanu was inclined to see 1046 as the date of the Danube’s crossing by the Pechenegs.<sup>326</sup> Like Diaconu, Mănuclu-Adameşteanu “moved” the area of Pecheneg settlement in the 1040s–50s from Dobruja to Northern Bulgaria. The Uz invasion of 1064–65 left a mark in hoards, while the disturbances of the 1070s–1090s in Dobruja had almost no impact on the circulation of Byzantine coins. From this the Romanian numismatist concluded that Pechenegs did not settle in Dobruja *en masse* and that Byzantium did not entirely lose control of the region. At the same time, Mănuclu-Adameşteanu doubted that an autonomous political entity existed in Paristrion.

The Pecheneg invasions of Byzantium were considered by Mănuclu-Adameşteanu separately.<sup>327</sup> The Romanian numismatist questioned Georgi Atanasov’s dating of the emission of the anonymous Class B folles (and, accordingly, the times and routes of Pecheneg raids), and generally rejected Philip Grierson’s classification of the Byzantine folles of this period in favor of Cécile Morriſson’s conclusions.<sup>328</sup> Mănuclu-Adameşteanu was also skeptical of the Bulgarian numismatists Parushev’s and Atanasov’s claim that Dobruja

- 
- Dobruja (with the exception of the archaeological site of Satu Nou – Capul Dealului, Constanța region, which may have been destroyed in the hostilities of 1032, as it lacks class C folles, minted in 1034–41). In 1036, the nomads completely or partially destroyed the settlements and fortifications at Capidava, Dinogetia, Troesmis (the eastern fortress), Dervent, Tulcea, Enisala, Ghiolul Pietrei, and other locations. Interestingly, the invasion of a large Pecheneg force across the Danube during the confrontation between Kegen and Tyrach did not leave a noticeable trace in the form of hoards – possibly the only hoard of that period in Dobruja is a deposit of folles discovered in Păcuilul lui Soare (Ibid., 119).
- 326 This problem was addressed in a special essay: Gheorghe Mănuclu-Adameşteanu and Stoyan Őordanov, “Monede bizantine din secolele X–XI descoperite pe teritoriul localității Garvăn, ținutul Silistra și invazia pecenegilor din 1046–1047,” in *Simpozion de numismatică organizat în memoria martirilor căzuți la Valea Albă, la împlinirea a 525 de ani (1476–2001) Chișinău, 13–15 mai 2001, Comunicări, studii și note* (Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 2002), 125–38.
- 327 Gheorghe Mănuclu-Adameşteanu, “Les invasions des Pethénègues au Bas-Danube (1027–1048),” *ÉByz* 4 (2001), 87–112; Idem, “Les invasions des Petchénègues au Bas Danube,” in *Numizmatichni, sfragistichni i epigrafski prinosi kŭm istoriyata na Chernomorskoto kraibrezhie (Proceedings of the International Conference “Numismatic and Sphragistic Contributions to History of the Western Black Sea Coast,” Varna, September 12th–15th, 2001)*, eds. Valeri Őotov and Igor Lazarenko (Varna, 2004), 299–311. The same article in Russian: Idem, “Nashestviya pechenegov na Nizhnem Dunaye (1027–1048 gg.);” Mănuclu-Adameşteanu and Őordanov, “Monede bizantine din secolele X–XI descoperite pe teritoriul localității Garvăn, ținutul Silistra și invazia pecenegilor din 1046–1047.”
- 328 Defending the chronology proposed by Morriſson (1028–32 as the dates of the emission of the anonymous folles of class B), Mănuclu-Adameşteanu argued that the heaviest blow to the lands of the *theme* of Bulgaria was dealt by the raids of 1032 and 1034, when fifteen hoards were deposited and ten settlements abandoned: Mănuclu-Adameşteanu, “Les invasions des Petchénègues au Bas Danube,” 308.

was completely depopulated as a result of the Pecheneg raids, as well as of the speculation that Byzantium lost control over the territory between the Danube and the Black Sea after the events of 1046–53.<sup>329</sup> He also considered the major Cuman incursion of 1095 into Byzantium<sup>330</sup> and the destruction caused by the Pecheneg raid of 1122.<sup>331</sup> As for the Cuman invasion of 1148, Mănuclu-Adameșteanu pinned it down to the area of Isaccea.<sup>332</sup>

The achievements of Balkan numismatics in the study of Pecheneg, Uz, and Cuman raids on Byzantium in the 10th to 12th centuries were summed up by Alexandru Madgearu of the Institute for Political Studies of Defense and Military History (Bucharest) in his book *Byzantine Military Organization on the Danube*.<sup>333</sup>

Actively involved in archaeological fieldwork since 1985 and still active in the field to this day, Madgearu gradually turned towards the early medieval history of Banat and Transylvania<sup>334</sup> and the history of the Lower Danube under the

329 Mănuclu-Adameșteanu, “Nashestviya pechenegov na Nizhnem Dunaye (1027–1048 gg.),” 351–2, 358.

330 Idem, “Din nou despre atacul cumanilor din anul 1095 și încetarea locuirii de la Păciuil lui Soare”; Idem, *Istoria Dobrogei în perioada 969–1204*, 191–5. Baumann and Mănuclu-Adameșteanu also suggest that Tulcea may have been sacked in the Cuman raid of 1095 or the Pecheneg raid of 1122: Victor Heinrich Baumann and Gheorghe Mănuclu-Adameșteanu, “Isaccea, jud. Tulcea [Noviodunum],” in *Cronica Cercetărilor Arheologice din România. Campania 2000*, eds. Mircea V. Angelescu et al. (Bucharest: CIMEC – Institutul de Memorie Culturală, 2001), 109.

331 In Mănuclu-Adameșteanu’s view, there are reasons to believe that this attack devastated, among others, the settlements at Nufăru and Ostrov-Beroe: Idem, *Istoria Dobrogei în perioada 969–1204*, 48, 158–62.

332 Ibid., 195–7.

333 Madgearu, *Byzantine Military Organization on the Danube*, 3–4, 101–44. It was first published in Romanian as *Organizarea militară bizantină la Dunăre în secolele X–XII* (Târgoviște: Editura Cetate de Scaun, 2007). Bojana Krsmanović, “[Review of:] Alexandru Madgearu, *Byzantine Military Organization on the Danube, 10th–12th Centuries*. Leiden, Boston: Brill 2013. 212 S.,” *SOF* 73 (2014), 538–42. For critical observations on this book, see: Tüpkova-Zaimova and Stoimenov, “Otnovo na Dolni Dunav (kraya na X–XI v.)” Even earlier, the productive work of the region’s numismatists and sigillographers was noted by Paul Stephenson in his *Byzantium’s Balkan Frontier*.

334 Alexandru Madgearu, “Contribuții privind datarea conflictului dintre ducele bănățean Ahtum și regele Ștefan I al Ungariei,” *Banatica* 12 (1993), no. 2, 5–12; Idem, “‘Gesta Hungarorum’ despre prima pătrundere a ungarilor în Banat,” *RI* (1996), no. 1–2, 5–22; Idem, “Despre situația geopolitică a Banatului în secolele IV–XII,” *Anuar. Studii de politică de apărare și istorie militară* (1997), 149–61; Idem, “Geneza și evoluția voievodatului bănățean din secolul al X-lea,” *Studii și materiale de istorie medie* 16 (1998), 191–207; Idem, “Romanitatea târzie din Pannonia (Transdanubia) și primele contacte ale ungarilor cu românii apuseni,” in *Armată și societate în spațiul românesc. Epoca veche și milenul migrațiilor*, ed. Mircea Dogaru (Bucharest: Globus, 1999), 115–59; Idem, “Voievodatul

Byzantine rule.<sup>335</sup> His expert skills in the interpretation of sources (both archaeological and written) and knowledge of the historiography allowed him to make valuable contributions to the study of Byzantium’s relations with Turkic nomads.

Continuing the Romanian historiographical tradition in the study of Banat, Madgearu, while reluctant to support the theory of the early appearance of the Pechenegs in Banat and Transylvania,<sup>336</sup> nevertheless suggested that in 927 the ruler of Banat Glad might have had help from the Pechenegs or Kabars in his struggle against the Hungarians.<sup>337</sup> In another article,<sup>338</sup> he accepted the hypothesis of the Pecheneg origin of Achtum – but later rejected it in favor of the “Kabar-Khazar” theory.<sup>339</sup> The outcome of his interest in medieval Transylvania was a meticulous study of one of the major sources for the history of the region – the work of the Anonymous Notary.<sup>340</sup> Madgearu gave an overview of the state of research on the *Gesta Hungarorum* (an important source for the history of the Pechenegs in Europe), noted that in 1027 the Pechenegs invaded not only Byzantine, but also Hungarian territory, and considered the

---

lui Menumorout în lumina cercetărilor recente,” *Analele Universității din Oradea. Istorie-arheologie* 11 (2001), 38–51.

- 335 Idem, “Revenirea dominației bizantine la Dunăre,” *Anuar. Studii de securitate, apărare națională și istorie militară* (1998), 145–57; Idem, “Unele observații asupra istoriei themei Paradunavon (despre Vasile Apokapes),” *Pontica* 31 (1998), 239–44; Idem, “The Military Organization of Paradunavon,” *BS* 60 (1999), no. 2, 421–46; Idem, “Dunărea în epoca bizantină (secolele X–XII): o frontieră permeabilă,” *RI* (1999), no. 1–2, 41–55; Idem, “The Periphery against the Centre: The Case of Paradunavon. (The Abstract of the Communication),” in *XXe Congrès International des Études Byzantines. Pré-actes, III. Communications libres* (Paris: Collège de France, 2001), 198; Idem, “The Restoration of the Byzantine Rule on the Danube,” *RÉSEE* 37–38 (1999–2000), no. 1–2, 5–23; Idem, “Observații asupra revoltei din Paradunavon din 1072–1091”; Idem, “The Periphery against the Centre: The Case of Paradunavon,” *ZRVI* 40 (2003), 49–56.
- 336 Idem, “Geneza și evoluția voievodatului bănățean din secolul al X-lea,” 198. In an essay on the Romanian population’s relationship with the Pechenegs, Madgearu argued that the latter, even though they invaded this region repeatedly in the 10th and 11th centuries, settled there no earlier than the mid-12th century; Idem, “Români și pecenegi în sudul Transilvaniei.”
- 337 Idem, “Geneza și evoluția voievodatului bănățean din secolul al X-lea,” 198–9; Idem, “‘Gesta Hungarorum’ despre prima pătrundere a ungarilor în Banat,” 22. Possible archaeological evidence of the semi-independent existence of the state of Glad even after the Hungarian conquest is presented in an article by the Serbian historians Dejan Radičević and Perica Špehar: Dejan Radičević and Perica Špehar, “Porfirogenitovi međaši na Istru i staromadaški arheološki nalazi u Vojvodini,” *ZRVI* 52 (2015), 49.
- 338 Idem, “Contribuții privind datarea conflictului dintre ducele bănățean Achtum și regele Ștefan I al Ungariei,” *Banatica* 12 (1993), no. 2, 8.
- 339 Idem, “Geneza și evoluția voievodatului bănățean din secolul al X-lea,” 206.
- 340 Idem, *The Romanians in the Anonymous Gesta Hungarorum. Truth and Fiction* (Cluj-Napoca: Romanian Cultural Institute, 2005).

archaeological footprint of the 1068 Pecheneg raid through the lands of the Hungarian crown.<sup>341</sup>

Much more important were Madgearu's conclusions in the landmark article "The Danube in the Byzantine Era (10th to 12th Centuries): A Permeable Frontier."<sup>342</sup> While in the times of the Roman Empire the Danubian *limes* was a rigid demarcation line between the *oikumene* and the barbarian world, after the restoration of Byzantine rule on the Danube in the late 10th to early 11th centuries it became, in Madgearu's view, a "gray zone," a periphery with a semi-barbarian population and way of life. An extremely important role was played in the region by Turkic nomads – the Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans. Drawing on the obvious analogy and previous historiography, Madgearu argued that for at least two decades there existed in the Balkans an autonomous political entity (or several entities) ruled by the chieftains Chelgu, Tatous, Seslav, and Satzas and based on a synthesis of the nomadic and sedentary ways of life.<sup>343</sup>

Citing the example of the medieval region of Zeta, Madgearu discussed the possibility of the emergence in the Byzantine borderlands of political entities balancing between autonomy and independence; he considered Paradunavon through an analogy with southern Dalmatia and its ruler Stefan Vojislav.<sup>344</sup> In his view, Byzantium's loss of the full control of Paradunavon and the breaching of the defense lines by nomads in the first half of the 11th century forced Constantinople to change the principles of its defense policy and resort to the creation of the *theme* of Πατζιναχία in the northeast of modern Bulgaria. Pechenegs were settled in this territory.<sup>345</sup> The new region, according to Madgearu, had broad political autonomy and was ruled by the *vestarches* Nestor, a kind of Lower-Danube counterpart to Stefan Vojislav. However, when Constantinople discontinued the annual subsidies that paid for the Pechenegs' obedience, the *theme* rebelled against the imperial center in league with the nomads.<sup>346</sup> Although this revolt was suppressed, it led to an even greater dis-

341 Ibid., 35, 114, 119–25.

342 Madgearu, "Dunărea în epoca bizantină (secolele X–XII): o frontieră permeabilă."

343 The scholar delved deeper into this question in a paper presented at the Paris congress of Byzantine studies in 2001 ("The Periphery against the Centre: The Case of Paradunavon (The Abstract of the Communication)"; the paper was later published in the *ZRVI*) and in the article "Notes on the Uprising in Paradunavon" ("Observații asupra revoltei din Paradunavon din 1072–1091"). See also: Madgearu, *The Asanids. The Political and Military History of the Second Bulgarian Empire (1185–1280)*, 51.

344 Idem, "Observații asupra revoltei din Paradunavon din 1072–1091," 36–7.

345 However, in Madgearu's view, the Pechenegs themselves were not eager to relocate to the imperial territory; they were settled there by the will of the Byzantine government and under its supervision: Madgearu, *Byzantine Military Organization on the Danube*, 170.

346 Idem, "Observații asupra revoltei din Paradunavon din 1072–1091," 34–5.



tancing of the Lower Danubian lands from the empire – and it was at this time that an autonomous mint started operating in Dobruja. The general instability in Byzantium and quick succession of emperors contributed to this state of affairs. Finally, shortly before the decisive clash between Byzantium and the Chelgu-Salomon coalition (1087), Πατζινάκια became independent.<sup>347</sup> Only the decisive actions of Alexios I Komnenos and his alliance with the Cumans, which resulted in the Pecheneg defeat at Levounion, made the return of the lands of the Lower Danube into the bosom of the empire possible. However, in a longer-term perspective, outlined by Madgearu in the 1999 article about the Danubian frontier, Byzantium did eventually lose control of the area between the Balkans and the Danube. This loss paved the way for the raids of 1094, 1114, 1122, and 1148 and eventually for the emergence of the Asen state.<sup>348</sup>

Madgearu’s accomplishments in illuminating the role of nomads in the history of Byzantium<sup>349</sup> built on the achievements of “classical” Byzantinology in the study of this problem. In particular, his articles published in 1999–2003 show the impact of the turn that occurred in Byzantinologists’ attitude towards

---

347 In the view of Paul Stephenson, the defense of the idea that Paristrion (or Dobruja) were independent is politically motivated: Paul Stephenson, “The Balkan Frontier in the Year 1000,” in *Byzantium in the Year 1000*, ed. Paul Magdalino (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2003), 115. In a later study, Madgearu clarified that Πατζινάκια formally remained under imperial control, “because the title of archon was given only to rulers of autonomous regions on the periphery” (Madgearu, *Byzantine Military Organization on the Danube*, 123). See also: Ion Bica, *Thema Paristrion (Paradounavon) în istoriografia bizantină și română* (Pitești: Editura Universității din Pitești, 2003).

348 Madgearu, “Dunărea în epoca bizantină (secolele X–XII): o frontieră permeabilă,” 50–3. It is easy to notice in this article the strong influence of an earlier study of his on the fall of the late Roman/early Byzantine frontier (Idem, “The Downfall of the Lower Danubian Late Roman Frontier,” *RRH* (1997), no. 3–4, 315–36). Madgearu is generally inclined to make historical comparisons. Thus, in the article “A Comparison between Two Migrations in the Byzantine Empire: the Goths and the Pechenegs” (in *Plural* 3 (2015), no. 2, 17–26) he argued that unsuccessful imperial policies in both cases resulted in substantial material and human losses. Vasile Mărculeț has also authored an article on the end of the Pecheneg domination on the Lower Danube after their defeats in 1091 and 1122–23: Vasile Mărculeț, “Considérations concernant la fin du pouvoir des Petchénègues du Bas-Danube,” *Annales d’Université “Valahia” Târgoviște. Section d’Archéologie et d’Histoire* 14 (2012), no. 2, 93–104.

349 Including in his latest works; for instance, Madgearu, “Pechenegs in the Byzantine Army”; Idem, “The War of 971 in Bulgaria: A Model of Conflict Resolution for Present Superpowers,” *Bulgaria mediaevalis* 7 (2016), 373–9.

medieval nomads, reflected in the works of Élisabeth Malamut,<sup>350</sup> Héléne Ahrweiler,<sup>351</sup> and Paul Stephenson.<sup>352</sup>

A revolutionary idea regarding Pecheneg presence in the Balkans was put forward by the Romanian-American scholar Florin Curta of the University of Florida in his article “The Image and Archaeology of the Pechenegs.”<sup>353</sup> First, he contrasts the *DAI*’s detailed information on the Pechenegs with the rather terse and uninformative testimony of the Byzantine authors of the 11th and 12th centuries.<sup>354</sup> Curta believes that this testimony cannot be relied upon, because it was merely “another way to reveal the rhetorical sophistication of the medieval sources.”<sup>355</sup> Second, he questions the viability of using particular archaeological finds as markers of Pecheneg presence (he called them “Pecheneg” artifacts) – “from clay kettles and handmade pottery to leaf-shaped pendants with open-work ornament, horseman-shaped amulets, jingle bells, appliqués, and bridle mounts, arrow heads, and stirrups.”<sup>356</sup> Curta also stresses the difference between the funerary rite and grave goods found in Dobruja and Bulgaria and funerary complexes north of the Danube. Instead of seeing in the 11th-century *Σκύθαι* and *Πατζινάχοι* the nomadic ethnos of the Pechenegs known from the *DAI*, he suggests treating them as a conglomerate of various Balkan population groups of that era, a “regional identity formed [on a multi-ethnic basis] in the region of the Hundred Hills.”<sup>357</sup> In tackling the problem of

350 Malamut, “L’image byzantine des Petchénègues.”

351 Héléne Ahrweiler, “Byzantine Concepts of the Foreigner: The Case of the Nomads,” in *Studies on the Internal Diaspora of the Byzantine Empire*, eds. Héléne Ahrweiler and Angeliki E. Laiou (Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1998), 1–15.

352 Stephenson, *Byzantium’s Balkan Frontier*, 80–116. We can see this quite clearly in a long response by Madgearu to Stephenson’s book about Byzantium’s Balkan frontier (Madgearu, “Rethinking the Byzantine Balkans”). Perhaps it is under the influence of Paul Stephenson’s conception of “trading over raiding” (Stephenson, *Byzantium’s Balkan Frontier*, 115) that Madgearu stresses the existence of commercial relations between the Byzantines and Pechenegs in Moldavia and Wallachia (Madgearu, *Byzantine Military Organization on the Danube*, 122).

353 Curta, “The Image and Archaeology of the Pechenegs”; Russian version: “Образ и археология печенегов,” *Stratum plus* (2013), no. 5, 203–34. (Paper presented at the 45th Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Oxford, March 24–26, 2012). Curta has also written a paper on the past and prospects of the archaeological study of medieval nomads: *The Archaeology of Medieval Nomadism in Eastern Europe (10th–13th Centuries): the Current State of Research*. Presented at the 81st Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, Orlando, Florida, 2016.

354 Curta, “The Image and Archaeology of the Pechenegs,” 143–55.

355 *Ibid.*, 178.

356 *Ibid.*, 157.

357 *Ibid.*, 180.

the Pechenegs in the Balkans, Curta clearly attempts to reinterpret it in line with his equally revolutionary arguments from *The Making of the Slavs*.<sup>358</sup> He also does a great deal to draw attention to the topic of the late nomads in the Balkans in his book *Southeastern Europe in the Middle Ages*.<sup>359</sup>

Overall, we may distinguish three stages in the study of the history of Byzantine-nomadic relations in post-war Romania. The first stage (1945 to the mid-1960s) witnessed extensive archaeological excavations across the country, during which a considerable amount of source material for the study of this subject was accumulated. Excavations were carried out mainly on the sites of ancient Roman and Byzantine settlements, as well as those of early medieval cultures, which were thought to have been created by an autochthonous population. The search for the origins of the Romanian people and their language was asserted as the main task of Romanian archaeology and medieval studies. The theory of Daco-Romanian continuity dominated historiography; traces of Romanian population were sought on most archaeological sites. At the same time, considerable amounts of newly-discovered material were attributed to nomads. Ion Barnea and a number of his colleagues began to analyze this material, building on the legacy of pre-war Byzantine studies in Romania.

At this stage, the *SCIV/SCIVA*, *SCIM*, *Dacia*, *MCA*, *Studii și cercetări de numismatică*, *RESEE*, and other periodicals were launched or restarted. The Vasile Pârvan Institute of Archaeology resumed work in 1956; in 1963, it became the Institute for Southeastern European Studies. A year earlier, the Romanian Society for Byzantine Studies was established. Ideologically, the first stage was

---

358 Idem, *The Making of the Slavs: History and Archaeology of the Lower Danube Region, c. 500–700* (Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001). In this work, Florin Curta brings together a broad range of archaeological finds from the Balkans and neighboring regions seen as relics of the early Slavs, as well as the evidence of written sources, and analyses these materials drawing on the latest advances in the field of anthropology (in particular the work of David Anthony and Irving Rouse on the theory of migrations). In Curta's view, the "name 'Sclavene' was a purely Byzantine construct, designed to make sense of a complicated configuration of *ethnies* on the other side of the northern frontier of the Empire" (Ibid., 118–9). He also proposes that scholars stop dwelling on the widely-known bow fibulae in their studies of the archaeological legacy of the Slavs (Florin Curta, "Slavic Bow Fibulae? Werner's Class I D Revisited," *Acta Archaeologica ASH* 57 (2006), no. 4, 423–74). Similarly, he argues for abandoning the view that clay kettles or leaf-shaped pendants can serve as archaeological markers of the Pechenegs.

359 Idem, *Southeastern Europe in the Middle Ages*. See also the chapter on "Oghuz, Pechenegs, and Cumans: Nomads of Medieval Europe?" in Idem, *Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages (500–1300)*, vol. 1 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2019), 152–78. Cf. John V.A. Fine, *The Early Medieval Balkans: A Critical Survey from the Sixth to the Late Twelfth Century* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1983).

marked by the introduction of the Marxist methodology and a strong influence of Soviet historical scholarship.

During this period, the question of relations between Byzantium and the nomads of the North Pontic steppes in the 10th and 11th centuries mostly came up episodically, in write-ups of archaeological excavations. The abandonment of the Dridu culture sites and traces of fires and devastation scarring the remnants of many Byzantine settlements were associated with nomads. However, there also began to appear some interest in the past of the steppe-dwellers themselves.

The second stage, which continued from the mid-1960s to 1989, began with the appearance of works digesting the wealth of already discovered materials. These were primarily collections systematizing the work done on individual sites (*Dinogetia*, *Capidava*, *Păcuil lui Soare*, and others), as well as general overviews, such as the third volume of *Din istoria Dobrogei*, Diaconu's monographs on the Pechenegs and Cumans on the Lower Danube, and *The Circulation of Byzantine Coins in the Carpathian-Danubian Region* by Constantin Preda. The second and third volumes of *Fontes Historiae Daco-Romanae* came out, containing translations of Byzantine sources for the history of the Lower Danube. The accomplishments of Romanian scholars became known to the broad scholarly community as they took part in the international congresses of Byzantine studies in Oxford, Bucharest, and Athens.

Thanks to the efforts of Barnea, Diaconu, Spinei, and others, the study of medieval nomads on the Lower Danube became a subject in its own right, distinct from the history of Byzantium and history of the Romanian people. New works summarized the available archaeological, numismatic, and sigillographic material.

The third stage, which began with the fall of the communist dictatorship and continues to this day, is marked by the reevaluation of the methodological underpinnings of scholarship, the expansion of the sphere of interests of Romanian medievalists and the range of their international contacts, and deeper engagement with the literature published in the neighboring countries and around the world. Extensive archaeological excavations are continually bringing to light new sources, especially numismatic and sigillographic.

#### 4 Bulgarian Historiography

Like Romania, the territory of present-day Bulgaria was part of the theatre in which the history of the relations between Constantinople and the Pechenegs,

Uzes and Cumans was acted out. Various nomadic Turkic peoples of the north Pontic steppes, beginning with the Bulgars (who became an integral part of the Bulgarian people and gave it its name), were a constant presence in Bulgaria’s Middle Ages.

The Pechenegs, first brought in as allies by Tsar Simeon (893–927) early in his reign, remained an important factor in Bulgarian history at least until the early 12th century. The Cumans, who crossed the Danube for the first time in the second half of the 11th century, would not leave the region in peace from that time on. In the last quarter of the 12th century, their help was crucial in the creation of the Second Bulgarian Empire; its founders, the brothers Asen and Peter, were probably of Cuman origin.<sup>360</sup> In the 13th century, large numbers of Cumans migrated to the territory of modern Bulgaria; for a long time, the Bulgarian state was ruled by dynasties of Cuman descent – the Terterids and Shishmanids. In addition to the Gagauzes,<sup>361</sup> the Cuman ethnic footprint is found in such Balkan ethnic groups as the Surguch and Gajal.<sup>362</sup> The bond between the histories of Bulgaria and Byzantium is even tighter.

All this should have encouraged interest among Bulgarian medievalists in Turkic nomads, Byzantium, and interactions between them. However, even a cursory examination of the Bulgarian historiography of the 1940s to 1980s shows that relations between Byzantium (or Bulgaria, for that matter) and Turkic nomads in the 10th and 11th centuries suffered from academic neglect, as noted by Bulgarian scholars themselves.<sup>363</sup>

There were a number of reasons for this lack of attention to the role of the 10th- and 11th-century Turkic nomads in the history of Bulgaria. For one thing, Bulgarian medieval studies in the post-war period shifted their focus from political to socio-economic history and increasingly found themselves stressing the role of “Slavs” in the history of Bulgaria, as opposed to “Turks” (see

360 Vászary, *Cumans and Tatars*, 38–42. See also: Ivan Bozhilov, *Familiyata na Asenevtsi (1186–1460)*. *Genealogiya i prosopografiya* (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bŭlgarskata akademiya na naukite, 1994), 18; Madgearu, *The Asanids. The Political and Military History of the Second Bulgarian Empire (1185–1280)*, 63. Kamen Stanev does not even rule out the possibility of Pecheneg descent: Kamen Stanev, “Migratsiya ot Trakiya kŭm Severna Bŭlgariya v kraya na XII–nachaloto na XIII vek i neŭnite posleditsi,” in *Srednovekovniyat bŭlgarin i “drugite”*. *Sbornik v chest na 60-godishninata na prof. din Petŭr Angelov*, eds. Angel Nikolov and Georgi Nikolov (Sofia: Universitetsko izdatelstvo “Sv. Kliment Okhridski,” 2013), 213–4.

361 The theory of the Cuman origin of the Gagauzes is supported by Georgi Atanasov: Georgi Atanasov, *Dobrudzhanskoto despotstvo: kŭm politicheskata, tsŭrkovnata, stopanskata i kulturnata istoriya na Dobrudzha prez XIV vek* (Veliko Tarnovo: Faber, 2009), 401–44.

362 Plamen Pavlov, “Po vŭprosa za zaselvaniyata na kumani v Bŭlgariya prez XIII v.,” in *Vtori mezhdunaroden kongres*, 629.

363 Ibid.

above). Another important reason was the “lagging” of Bulgarian archaeology. This phenomenon may be explained by the fact that by the mid-20th century Bulgarian historiography had already formed a confident picture of the origin and development of the Bulgarian people and statehood in the Middle Ages, while Romanian historical scholarship, although it generally adhered to conceptions laid down in the 19th and early 20th centuries, was conscious of a dearth of source evidence necessary to confirm or refute them. If we project onto historical writing the thoughts of the American philosopher of science Thomas S. Kuhn, theories of the genesis of their peoples and states, the formulation of which preoccupied historians from the “new” nations of Eastern Europe in the 19th and 20th centuries, can be compared to paradigms (of course, keeping in mind the limitations of this comparison).<sup>364</sup> For at least the first two post-war decades, Romanian medievalists enthusiastically collected source material, which eventually came together in the crystallization of such a theory (“paradigm”) in the mid-1960s. In the process, and due to the original lack of a “paradigm” (or at least its blurriness), a solid bedrock of archaeological and other sources was created for the study of the history of nomads in Romania.

#### 4.1 *Archaeology*

The relative profusion of written sources for the early history of Bulgaria has led to Bulgarian scholars' showing less interest in medieval archaeology.<sup>365</sup> Archaeological materials have been (and in many respects remain) secondary to the study of medieval Bulgarian history, and during archaeological

364 Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970), 15: “In the absence of a paradigm or some candidate for paradigm, all of the facts that could possibly pertain to the development of a given science are likely to seem equally relevant.” On the use of the concept of paradigm in historiography see Gavin Lucas, “The Paradigm Concept in Archaeology,” *World Archaeology* 49 (2017), 1–11.

365 On Bulgarian archaeology falling behind Romanian, see: Uwe Fiedler, “Bulgars in the Lower Danube Region. A Survey of the Archaeological Evidence and of the State of Current Research,” in *The Other Europe*, 217. See also: Boris Borisov, “Demografskite promeni prez XI–XII vek v dneshnite bŭlgarski zemi (arkheologicheski svidetelstva),” in *Tangra: Sbornik v chest na 70-godishninata na akad. Vasil Gyuzelev*, ed. Milyana Kaïmakamova (Sofia: Universitetsko izdatelstvo “Sv. Kliment Okhridski,” 2006), 391–408; Lyuba Ilieva, “Gradskoto stopanstvo v zemite mezhdu Dunav i Stara Planina prez perioda na vizantiïskoto vladichestvo v bŭlgarskite zemi (XI–XII v.),” in *Tangra: Sbornik v chest na 70-godishninata na akad. Vasil Gyuzelev*, 559–77.

excavations, attention is focused on the First and Second Bulgarian Empires, Proto-Bulgarians, and Slavs.<sup>366</sup>

This is confirmed by the distribution of sites excavated by Bulgarian archaeologists before 1984. Dimitŭr Ovcharov (1931–2013) lists 40 fortresses and fortified structures, 16 unfortified settlements, 30 necropolises, 19 monasteries, 15 rock monasteries, and several heathen sanctuaries.<sup>367</sup> In addition to early Bulgarian settlements, the ancient Bulgarian capitals Pliska, Preslav, and Veliko Tarnovo and a number of large medieval cities, such as Melnik, Cherven, Pernik, Nikopol, and others, enjoyed priority treatment.<sup>368</sup> Beginning in the mid-1970s, with the 1300th anniversary of the creation of the First Bulgarian Empire (681–1981) looming closer, the “statist” themes grew only more prominent.<sup>369</sup> New interest, however, began to be shown towards the excavation of smaller settlements.

Nevertheless, as Romanian historiography began from the mid-1960s on to churn out more and more studies based on archaeological materials yielded by medieval sites on the Lower Danube, it became evident that Bulgarian archaeology had little to say in response.<sup>370</sup>

366 Evgeniya Komatarova-Balinova, “Issues and Myths in the Bulgarian Early Medieval Archaeology,” in *Stepi Vostochnoy Yevropy v sredniye veka. Sbornik pamyati Svetlany Aleksandrovny Pletnovoy*, ed. Igor’ Kyzlasov (Moscow: Avtorskaya Kniga, 2016), 259.

367 Dimitŭr Ovcharov, “Bŭlgarskata srednovekovna arkheologiya prez poslednite deset godini (1974–1984),” *Arkheologiya* (1984), no. 4, 47.

368 Krŭstyu Mijatev, “Das Schloss der bulgarischen Zaren in Tŭrnovo,” *Acta Archaeologica ASH* 17 (1965), no. 1–4, 77–81; Petŭr Petrov, “[Review of:] Zh. Vŭzharova, *Slavyanski i slavyanobŭlgarski selishta v bŭlgarskite zemi*,” 109–15; Mikhail Vojnov, “Preslav, Sredec, Ochrida – trois anciennes capitales des tzars et patriarches bulgares,” *Études historiques* 4 (1968), 167–73; Stefka Angelova, “Krepostnata stena na Durostorum-Drŭstŭr-Silistra,” *Arkheologiya* (1973), no. 3, 83–93; Vŭlo Vŭlov, “Vodosnabdyavaneto na srednovekovnite bŭlgarski gradove i kreposti (VII–XIV v.),” *Arkheologiya* (1977), no. 1, 14–30; Stancho Vaklinov, “Pliska, Preslav, Madara. Razkopki i prouchvaniya,” in *Pliska – Preslav* 1 (1979), 7–17; Dimitŭr Ovcharov, “Kŭm vŭprosa za ukrepitefnata deŭnost na bŭlgarskata dŭrzhava po Dolni Dunav prez IX–XI v.,” *Voennioistoricheski sbornik* (1979), no. 2, 96–106; Irina Shtereva, “Kŭm prouchvaneto na poselishtniya zhivot v Yugoiztochna Bŭlgariya prez kŭsnata antichnost i rannoto srednovekovie,” in *Vtori mezhdunaroden kongres*, 368–72. This was observed as far back as the mid-1950s by the Romanian archaeologist Gheorghe Ștefan, “Note despre activitatea arheologică în Republica Populară Bulgaria,” *SCIV* 6 (1955), no. 1–2, 281–5. It is interesting to note that Hungarian archaeology took an entirely different path – from villages to royal residences: Imre Holl, “Mittelalterarchäologie in Ungarn (1946–1964),” *Acta Archaeologica ASH* 22 (1970), no. 1–4, 365–78, 406–10.

369 Ovcharov, “Bŭlgarskata srednovekovna arkheologiya prez poslednite deset godini (1974–1984),” 47–9.

370 There was a time when Bulgarian scholars had to accept without question the verdicts of Romanian archaeologists, even those that did not at all sit well with the

Thus, Borislav Primov (1918–84), in an essay on the economic and political role of the First Bulgarian Empire in Europe, drew on the work of Romanian archaeologists.<sup>371</sup> Dimitŭr Angelov, in his remarks on the talk given by Ion Barnea, Emil Condurachi, and Petre Diaconu in 1966 at the 13th International Congress of Byzantine Studies in Oxford, was unable to counter with any accomplishments of Bulgarian archaeology in the study of the Danubian *limes*.<sup>372</sup> Ivan Bozhilov, responding to the fundamental work of the Romanian archaeologist Eugenia Zaharia, had to use mostly research done by Romanian and Soviet scholars and rely on written sources in his criticism.<sup>373</sup> The same can be said about the joint response of Ivan Bozhilov and Vasil Gyuzelev to the publication of the third volume of the *Din istoria Dobrogei*.<sup>374</sup> Dimitŭr Ovcharov, in his attempt to dispute the dating of the Murfatlar-Basarabi complex to the late 10th century, proposed by Romanian archaeologists, and connect its creation with the First Bulgarian Empire, acknowledged that Bulgarian archaeology could not furnish him with sufficient arguments, and so he had to resort to deciphering graffiti.<sup>375</sup>

The Bulgaro-Romanian discussions regarding the complex at Murfatlar-Basarabi, the Dobruja inscription of 943, and the Stone Dyke in Dobruja amply testified to the “lagging” of Bulgarian archaeology. The stone with the inscription “Greeks ... 6451 ... župan Dimitr” was discovered as early as 1950,<sup>376</sup> but Bulgarian scholars’ reaction to this new source arrived only in 1968, when Gyuzelev suggested that the inscription should be linked to the activities of župan Dimitr, the Bulgarian governor of Dobruja, and to Pecheneg raiding.<sup>377</sup>

---

Bulgarian historiographical tradition. Thus, initially Bulgarian archaeologists even accepted the “proto-Romanian” attribution of the remains of the Balkan-Danubian culture found in Bulgaria, which they would later come to strenuously oppose: Sonya N. Georgieva-Kazandzhieva, “K voprosu o material’noy kul’ture slavyan i prabolgar na Nizhnem Dunaye,” *SovArkh* (1961), no. 2, 102.

371 Borislav Primov, “Za ikonomicheskata i politicheskata rolya na Pŭrvata Bŭlgarska dŭrzhava v mezhdunarodnite otnosheniya na srednovkovna Evropa,” *IstPreg* (1961), no. 2, 53.

372 Dimitŭr Angelov, “Trinadeseti kongres na vizantinistite,” *IstPreg* (1966), no. 6, 125.

373 Ivan Bozhilov, “Kulturata Dridu i Pŭrvoto Bŭlgarsko tsarstvo.”

374 Ivan Bozhilov and Vasil Gyuzelev, “[Review of]: Barnea I., *Ştefănescu Şt., Din istoria Dobrogei*.”

375 Dimitŭr Ovcharov, “Za kharaktera i prinadlezhnostta na srednovkovnite risunki ot Basarab (Murfatlar),” *Arkheologiya* (1975), no. 3, 2.

376 Comşa and Popescu, “Cercetări arheologice pe trasul canalului Dunăre – Marea Neagră,” 170.

377 Vasil Gyuzelev, “Dobrudzhanskiyat nadpis i sübitiyata v Bŭlgariya prez 943 g.,” 47–8. In Veliki Preslav, an inscription was found in 1967 that Totyu Totev connected with Cuman presence: Totyu Totev, “Za kumani v edin nadpis ot Preslav,” in *Kulturata na*



Ovcharov’s article on Murfatlar appeared in 1975;<sup>378</sup> Veselin Beshevliev’s (1900–92) – in 1977;<sup>379</sup> and Rasho Rashev’s study of the Stone Dike – in 1979.<sup>380</sup> It is important to note that Rashev, hypothesizing that the stone rampart was built against Pechenegs and Magyars as early as the reign of Tsar Simeon and was directly related to the complex at Basarabi (Murfatlar),<sup>381</sup> only echoed the views already aired in discussions among Romanian scholars.

The Pechenegs have figured in Bulgarian historiography and archaeology mainly as the “culprits” of cataclysms that befell Bulgarian and Byzantine villages and towns.<sup>382</sup> A geographical correlation could be found between sites

---

*srednovkovniya Tŭrnov*, eds. Atanas Popov and Velizar Velkov (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bŭlgarskata akademiya na naukite, 1985), 158–69.

- 378 Dimitŭr Ovcharov, “Za kharaktera i prinadlezhnosta na srednovkovnite risunki ot Basarab (Murfatlar),” 2.
- 379 Veselin Beševliev, “Beobachtungen über die protobulgarischen Inschriften bei Basarabi-Murfatlar,” *INMV* 13 (1977), 50–7.
- 380 Rasho Rashev, “Valovete v Dobrudzha (kŭm vŭprosa za khronologiyata i prednaznachenieto im),” *Arkheologiya* (1979), no. 1, 11–20.
- 381 *Ibid.*, 16–8.
- 382 Dimitŭr Angelov, *Bogomil’stvo v Bolgarii* (Moscow: Izdatel’stvo inostrannoy literatury, 1954), 107; Petŭr Petrov, “[Review of:] Zh. Vŭzharova, *Slavyanski i slavyanobŭlgarski selishta v bŭlgarskite zemi ot kraya na VI do XI v.* Izd. na BAN, Sofiya, 1965 g., 228 s.,” *IstPreg* (1965), no. 2, 114; Ivan Bozhilov, “[Review of:] Ī. Changova, *Srednovkovnoto selishte nad trakiŭskiya grad Sevtopolis (XI–XIV)*, Izd. na BAN, Sofiya, 1971, 150 s. vkl. 102 obraza,” *IstPreg* (1974), no. 1, 124; Atanas Milchev, “Gabrovo i negoviyat okrug prez srednovkovieto (VII–XIV),” *GSUIF* 69 (1975), 85; Milan Milanov, “Arkheologicheski objekti i nakhodki,” *Godishnik na muzeite ot Severozapadna Bŭlgariya* 3 (1979), 57–81; 5 (1981), 37–54; 7 (1982), 9–27; Lyubka Bobcheva, “Rannosrednovkovni bŭlgarski selishta i nekropoli po yuzhnodobrudzhanskiya chernomorskiya bryag,” in *Srednovkovna Bŭlgariya i Chernomoriето. Sbornik dokladi o nauchnata konferentsiya*, eds. Aleksandŭr Kuzev et al. (Varna: Knigoizdatelstvo “Georgi Bakalov,” 1982), 108; Lyudmila Doncheva-Petkova, “Nekropol pri yuzhniya sektor na zapadnata krepostna stena na Pliska,” in *Sbornik v pamet na prof. Stancho Vaklinov*, ed. Vasil Gyuzelev (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bŭlgarskata akademiya na naukite, 1984), 181–91; Shtereva, “Kŭm prouchvaneto na poseslishtniya zhivot v Yugoiztochna Bŭlgariya prez kŭsnata antichnost i rannoto srednovkovie,” 372; Angelova and Doncheva-Petkova, “Sŭstavŭt na naselenieto v Dobrudzha ot kraya na X do kraya na XI v.,” 380; Kiril Botov, “Rannosrednovkovni bŭlgarski selishta po yuzhното добруджанско краибрeзhie,” in *Trudy V Mezhdunarodnogo Kongressa arkheologov-slavistov. Kiyev, 18-25 sentyabrya 1985 g.*, vol. 2, eds. Boris A. Rybakov et al. (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1988), 209; Georgi Atanasov, “Etnodemografski promeni v Dobrudzha (X–XVI v.),” *IstPreg* (1991), no. 2, 79–80; *Idem*, “Rannosrednovkovni olovni ikonki sŭs sv. Georgi-voin ot Yuzhna Dobrudzha,” *Arkheologiya* (1992), no. 3, 36–42; Violetta Dimova, “Rannosrednovkovnata krepost do selo Tsar Asen, Silistrensko,” *Dobrudzha* 10 (1994), 65 and 73; Lyudmila Doncheva-Petkova, “Adornments from a 11th Century Pecheneg’s Necropolis by Odartsii Village, Dobrich District (North-Eastern Bulgaria),” *AB* 2 (1998), no. 3, 132; Pavel Georgiev, “Periodisierung und Chronologie der Besiedlung und des Baugeschehens im Gebiet um

with evidence of destruction and fires and Byzantine sources' reports on Pecheneg activities. Some examples include Sviatoslav's wars involving the Pechenegs that correlate with the destruction at Garvan, Popina, Nova Cherna, Vetren, Staro Selo, Nozharevo, and Topola, all in the provinces of Silistra or Dobrich; the Pecheneg raids of the first half of the 11th century, reflected in similar traces at Drüstür (Silistra), Odürtsi, Skala, Tsar Asen, Pliska, Okorsh, Gigen, Ruyno, etc.; and the events of the 1050s and 1060s, detectable at such sites as Haskovo, Südievo, Hisarlaka, Iskra, etc.<sup>383</sup> A view took hold in Bulgarian historiography that significant areas of the Balkan-Danubian region were abandoned by the local population.<sup>384</sup> It is interesting that relics of nomadic raids include not only evidence of destruction and fire, human remains with telltale wounds, or coin hoards, but also caches of agricultural implements.<sup>385</sup>

In the 1970s and 1980s, there was a steady tendency to treat the vast majority of Turkic nomadic remains in Bulgaria as belonging to the Proto-Bulgarians. For example, Lyubka Bobcheva attributed to them the notorious early medieval clay kettles and dated these to the 9th century.<sup>386</sup> According to Zhivko Aladzhev of the National Archaeological Institute with Museum at the

---

die Große Basilika von Pliska," in *Post-Roman Towns, Trade and Settlement in Europe and Byzantium*, vol. 2, *Byzantium, Pliska and the Balkans*, ed. Joachim Henning (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2007), 370.

383 Rumen Ivanov, Rosen Ivanov and Georgi Tomov, *Srednovekovnen nomadski nekropol ot Plovdiv (XI–XIII v.)* (Plovdiv: Studio 18, 2016), 47–54.

384 Chavdar Kirilov of the Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski" argues that statements about the mass abandonment of territories by the Bulgarian population after Pecheneg and Cuman raids are baseless: Chavdar Kirilov, "Mnimoto izselvane na búlgari ot Paristrion. Nyakoi belezhki po vǔprosa za demografskite protsesi mezhdú Dunav i Stara planina prez XI–XII v.," in *EURIKA: In honorem Ludmilae Donchevae-Petkoveae*, eds. Valeri Grigorov et al. (Sofia: Natsionalen arkheologicheski Institut s muzei, 2009), 355–74. Traces of destruction and fires notwithstanding, there is evidence that life continued in some neighborhoods of Pliska: Georgi Todorov, "Vǔnshniyat grad na Pliska prez XI vek," *Zhurnal za istoricheski i arkheologicheski izsledvaniya* (2019), no. 1, 73–4. For Kamen Stanev's critique of the views of Chavdar Kirilov, see: Kamen Stanev, "Migratsiya ot Trakiya kǔm Severna Búlgariya v kraya na XII–nachaloto na XIII vek i neinite posleditsi," 208.

385 Georgi Atanasov, "Klady zemledel'cheskikh orudiy iz Yuzhnoy Dobrudzhi (X–nachalo XI vv)," *Stratum plus* (2000), no. 5, 201–2; Stoyan Vitlyanov, "Kolektivna nakhodka ot zemedelski sechiva, skotovǔden inventar i orǔzhie ot Pliska," *Izvestiya na Istoricheskiya muzei Shumen* 10 (2002), 92–101.

386 Lyubka Bobcheva, "Glineni kotli ot rannosrednovekovnoto selishte pri s. Topole, Tolbukhinski okrǔg," *INMV* 16 (1980), 129–30. However, two years later Bobcheva published another study, in which she interpreted these kettles as Pecheneg: Eadem, "Rannosrednovekovni búlgarski selishta i nekropoli po yuzhnodobrudzhanskiya chernomorskiya bryag," in *Srednovekovna Búlgariya i Chernomoriето. Sbornik dokladi o nauchnata konferentsiya*, 108.

Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Proto-Bulgarian artifacts testify to the worship of the common Turkic cult of Tengri.<sup>387</sup> Rasho Rashev (1943–2008) viewed as Proto-Bulgarian the remains and models of yurts,<sup>388</sup> numerous images of horsemen,<sup>389</sup> and other evidence of the presence of Turkic nomads in the Balkans.<sup>390</sup> The Turkic runic signs and drawings at Murfatlar, which could only have belonged to nomads, were seen by Ovcharov and Beshevliev as relics of the Proto-Bulgarians.<sup>391</sup> The bronze pendants in the shape of horses with men’s heads, found throughout Bulgaria, for a long time were also attributed to this group.<sup>392</sup> Thanks to the works of Petür Boev, in the mid-1960s scholars came

- 
- 387 Zhivko Aladzhov, “Za kulta kŭm Tangra v srednovekovna Bŭlgariya,” *Arkheologiya* (1983), no. 1–2, 76. In another work, Aladzhov disputed the hypothesis of the Ukrainian historian Yaroslav Dashkevych and his Polish colleague Edward Tryjarski about the polyethnic origin of the kurgan stelae of the North Pontic steppes: Idem, “[Review of:] Ya.R. Dashkevich, E. Tryyarski, *Kamennyye baby prichernomorskikh stepey*. Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków, Gdańsk, Łódź. 1982, 231 s. 68 ill.,” *Arkheologiya* (1983), no. 1–2, 110–11.
- 388 Rasho Rashev, “Model na yurta ot Devnya,” *Arkheologiya* (1976), no. 1, 39–45.
- 389 Idem, “Konnikŭt v starobŭlgarskoto izkustvo,” *Arkheologiya*, 1984, 2–3, 60–3, 69. See also his “Dunavska Bŭlgariya i Tsentralna Aziya,” in *Vtori mezhdunaroden kongres*, 205–10.
- 390 In 2003, Rashev published a critical overview of some objects of nomadic material culture for a long time “patriotically” identified in Bulgarian historiography as Proto-Bulgarian (Rasho Rashev, “Sŭmnitelni i nedostoverni pametnitsi na prabŭlgarskata kultura,” in *Studia protobulgarica et mediaevalia europensia. V chest na prof. V. Beshevliev*, eds. Vasul Gyuzelev et al. (Sofia: Tangra TanNakRa, 2003), 158–74). In his analysis of this category of artifacts, Valeri İotov argues that it is entirely possible to attribute the *devtashlars* (stone monuments, stones placed according to a regular plan forming one or several configurations), the kurgans, the cult complex near the village of Zlatna Niva, the stone yurt from the town of Devnya, and some other objects to the cultures of the Pechenegs, Uzes, or Cumans: Valeri İotov, “Rannyya ili prabolgarskaya kul’tura. Chto nuzhno otmenit’, chto možhno dobavit’.”
- 391 Dimitür Ovcharov, “Za kharaktera i prinadlezhnostta na srednovekovnite risunki ot Basarab (Murfatlar),” 8–9; Idem, *Bŭlgarski srednovekovni risunki-graftiti* (Sofia: Septemvri, 1982); Beševliev, “Beobachtungen über die protobulgarischen Inschriften bei Basarabi-Murfatlar,” 56–7.
- 392 Stanislav Stanilov, “Starobŭlgarski koncheta amuleti,” *Pliska – Preslav* 5 (1992), 239–45; Rashev, “Sŭmnitelni i nedostoverni pametnitsi na prabŭlgarskata kultura,” 162–3; İoto Valeriev, “Belezhki vŭrkhu taka narechenite ‘amuleti – koncheta s mŭzhka glava,’” *Pliska – Preslav* 11 (2015), 435–40; *Odŭrtsi*, 1, 93–4. Doncheva-Petkova believes that these ornaments “rather seem to have been brought or used by Pechenegs” (*Odŭrtsi*, 2, 242). Ion Tentiuc attributes at least a percentage of them to Iranian-speaking Alans from the Northern Caucasus: Ion Tentiuc, “Despre pandantivele de cäläreți din perioada medievală timpurie în spațiul pruto-nistean,” *Tyragetia* 4 (19) (2010), no. 1, 225–33. İoto Valeriev inclines towards seeing them as Pecheneg – possibly an indication of the presence of an Iranian element among the migrating Pechenegs or a trace of Alanic cultural influence: İoto Valeriev, “Srednovekovni bronzovi amuleti konnitsi na Dolniya Dunav (XI–XII v.),” *Dobrudzha* 30 (2015), 378. Evgeniya Komatarova-Balinova and Petya

to believe that trepanned skulls were an exclusive mark of Proto-Bulgarian burials,<sup>393</sup> but 20 years later this was called into question.<sup>394</sup> The polyethnic (Avar or Pecheneg) nature of some medieval artifacts in Bulgaria was acknowledged in only a few studies.<sup>395</sup>

From the mid-1970s, Bulgarian archaeologists interpreted as Pecheneg markers the clay kettles with inside ears, remains of which turned up during the excavation of the fortresses and settlements of Drüstür (Silistra),<sup>396</sup> Tsar Asen, Odürtsi, Pliska, Preslav, Krivina, Kaliakra, Sliven (Khisarlūka), Vetren, Stürmen, Gigen, Iskra (Kargalar), Tutrakan, Balchik, and Skala.<sup>397</sup> On the other

---

Penkova object against any specific ethnic attribution of these artifacts, seeing in them, rather, a late-pagan “pattern, wandering not only in space but also in time”: Evgeniya Komatarova-Balinova and Petya Penkova, “The ‘Horse Amulets’ from the Collections of Vidin and Vratsa Museums – a Modest Contribution to a Continuous Discussion,” *AB* (2018), no. 3, 106. Alisa Borisenko and Yulii Khydyakov consider these bronze pendants (also widespread in Mongolia, beyond Lake Baikal, in the Altai-Sayan region, the Urals, Central Asia, and East Turkestan) as an expression of the Turkic nomadic tradition in general: Alisa Yu. Borisenko and Yulii S. Khydyakov, “Izobrazheniya voinov na torevitke tyurkskikh kochevnikov Tsentral’noy Azii rannego Srednevekov’ya,” *Arkheologiya, etnografiya i antropologiya Yevrazii* 36 (2008), no. 4, 43–53.

- 393 Petür Boev, “Simvolichni trepanatsii ot Būlgariya,” *Izvestiya na Instituta po Morfologiya* 9–10 (1964), 299–310; Petür Boev, Neli Kondova and Slavcho Cholakov, “Izkustvenata deformatsiya na glavata kato etnoopredelyasht beleg,” *Būlgarska etnografiya* 12 (1987), no. 1, 35–45; Marina S. Velikanova, “Dannyye paleoantropologii o peremeshchenii naseleniya v Dnestrovsko-prutskom mezhdurech’ye v I–II tysyacheletiyakh,” in *Slavyano-voloshskiyev svyazi*, ed. Nikolai A. Mokhov (Kishinev: Shtiintsa, 1978), 37–8.
- 394 See: İordan İordanov and Branimira Dimitrova, “Trepanatsii na cherepa u pogrebanite v srednovekovni nekrepol (X–XI v.) kraï selo Odürtsi, Dobrichko,” *Godishnik na Departament Arkheologiya* 4–5 (2000), 352–6; İordan İordanov and Branimira Dimitrova, “Danni ot antropologichnoto izsledvane na pogrebanite v srednovekovniya nekrepol № 2 pri s. Odürtsi, Dobrichko, XI v.,” in *Odürtsi*, 2, 415–60.
- 395 See, for instance, Komatarova-Balinova, “Issues and Myths in the Bulgarian Early Medieval Archaeology”; Todor Balabanov, “Masovoye zhilishche v Pliske (VIII–XI vv.,” in *Trudy V Mezhdunarodnogo Kongressa arkheologov-slavistov. Kiyev, 18–25 sentyabrya 1985 g.*, vol. 2, 14; Petür Boev, Neli Kondova and Slavcho Cholakov, “Srednovekovniyat nekrepol. Antropologicheski dani,” in *Pernik*, vol. 2, *Krepostta Pernik VIII–XIV v.*, ed. Dimitür Ovcharov (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Būlgarskata akademiya na naukite, 1983), 185–212; Petür Boev, “Antropologichno prouchvane na nekropola pri s. Kragulevo,” *INMV* 20 (1984), 59–64.
- 396 More than 300 were found in Drüstür alone: Teodora Krumova, “Pechenezhskiyev pamyatniki v Severo-Vostochnoy Bolgarii,” *Analele Asociației Naționale a Tinerilor Istorici din Moldova* (1999), no. 1, 142.
- 397 Doncheva-Petkova, “Srednovekovni glineni sūdove svütreshni ushi”; Dimitrov, “Nomadska keramika v Severoiztochna Būlgariya”; Georgi Dzhingov, “Kaliakra prez starobūlgarskata epokha (VII–XI v.,” *INMV* 17 (1981), 35; Michael Wendel, “Die mittelalterlichen Siedlungen,” in *Iatrus-Krivina: Spätantike Befestigung und frühmittelalterliche Siedlung*

hand, the presence of relatively large amounts of imported Byzantine pottery on the Lower Danube was seen as evidence of the Byzantine policy of “trading not raiding.”<sup>398</sup>

The reason for this was not so much the work of Petre Diaconu,<sup>399</sup> known in Bulgaria, as the article “Medieval Clay Kettles with Inside Ears”<sup>400</sup> by Lyudmila Doncheva-Petkova of the National Institute of Archaeology with the Museum at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences.<sup>401</sup> Having analyzed the body of published finds of these vessels in Bulgaria, Doncheva-Petkova grouped them into two types, different in shape and material.<sup>402</sup> She argued that Diaconu’s version best fit the numismatic and other material accompanying them and attributed the kettles found in Bulgaria to the Pechenegs.<sup>403</sup>

---

*an der unteren Donau*, vol. 3, *Die mittelalterlichen Siedlungen*, eds. Gerda von Bülow et al. (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1986), 144; Stefka Angelova, “Sur la caractéristique de la céramique du Haut Moyen Âge provenant de Drăstăr (Silistra),” in *Dobrudža: Études ethno-culturelles*, 98; Meri Radeva, “Srednovekovna keramika ot Sliven,” *Izvestiya na muzeite ot Yugoiztochna Bŭlgariya* 11 (1988), 47–9; Lyudmila Doncheva-Petkova, “Mittelalterliche Tonkessel aus Bulgarien,” in *Die Keramik der Saltovo-Majaki Kultur und ihrer Varianten*, 105; Stefka Angelova, “Kŭm topografiyata na srednovekovniya Drŭstŭr prez XII v.,” *Prinosi kŭm bŭlgarskata arkheologiya*, 2, ed. Dimitŭr Ovcharov (Sofia: Arges, 1993), 52–3; Georgi Atanasov and Ivan Ūordanov, *Srednovekovniyat Vetren na Dunav* (Shumen: Slavcho Nikolov i sie, 1994), 15; Liudmil Vagalinski and Emil Petkov, “Spasitelni razkopki na kŭsnorimskata krepostna stena na Transmariska (Tutrakan),” in *Arkheologicheski otkritiya i razkopki prez 1995 g. XXXIX*. (Sofia: Agato, 1996), 69; Valeri Ūotov and Georgi Atanasov, *Skala. Krepost ot X–XI v. do s. Kladentsi, Tervelsko* (Sofia: Pensoft, 1998), 67–9, 137; *Odŭrtsi*, 2, 168; Ivanov, Ivanov and Tomov, *Srednovekoven nomadski nekropol ot Plovdiv (XI–XIII v.)*, 13, 53; Rumen Ivanov, “Pechenezhki nashestviya v yuzhnobŭlgarskite zemi (po arkheologicheski danni ot nekropola pri s. Iskra, obsht. Pŭrvomaŭ),” *Zhurnal za istoricheski i arkheologicheski izsledvaniya* (2014), no. 1–2, 45–51.

398 Evelina Todorova, Rumyana Koleva and Chavdar Kirilov, “Byzantine Imported Pottery from the Recent Excavations in Drastar (Silistra) in the Context of the Byzantine Politics on the Lower Danube,” in *Proceedings of the 22nd International Congress of Byzantine Studies (Sofia, 22-27 August 2011)*, vol. 3, *Abstracts of Free Communications*, eds. Angel Nikolov et al. (Sofia: Bulgarian Historical Heritage Foundation, 2011), 38–9.

399 Diaconu, “Cu privire la problema cǎldǎrilor de lut în epoca feudalǎ timpurie (sec. X–XIII)”; Idem, “K voprosu o glinyanykh kotlakh na territorii RNR”; Idem, *Les Petchénègues au Bas-Danube*.

400 Doncheva-Petkova, “Srednovekovni glineni sŭdove s vŭtreshni ushi.”

401 For a general overview and bibliography of the work of Doncheva-Petkova, see: Violetta Nasheva, “In honorem Ljudmilae Donchevae-Petkovae”; “Bibliografiya na trudovete na st.n.s. I st. d-r Lyudmila Doncheva-Petkova,” in *EURIKA. In honorem Ludmilae Donchevae-Petkovae*, VII–XXI.

402 Doncheva-Petkova, “Srednovekovni glineni sŭdove s vŭtreshni ushi,” 32–4.

403 *Ibid.*, 37. After the appearance of this article, Dimitŭr Dimitrov (1927–88) connected some of the pottery found in the villages of Tsar Asen, Krivina, and others with the Pechenegs (Dimitrov, “Nomadska keramika v Severoiztochna Bŭlgariya”). See also:

Studying the 7th- to 11th-century settlements at Kladentsi, Bdintsi, Topola, Balchik, Khitovo, Rusenovovo, Durankulak, Odürtsi, Kaliakra, Kavarna, Tsar Asen, Garvan, Nava Cherna, Popina, Nozharevo, Sliven, and other locations, Doncheva-Petkova also came across traces of Pecheneg presence.<sup>404</sup> At that time (the 1980s), Bulgarian scholars found room in their works for only some “traces of material culture” with nomadic features,<sup>405</sup> occasional individual late nomadic burials,<sup>406</sup> or personal ornaments that could be attributed to nomads.<sup>407</sup> Until the fall of the communist regime in Bulgaria, the country’s archaeologists tried to avoid “exaggerating” the role of the late nomads in Bulgarian history.

Beginning in 1971, Lyudmila Doncheva-Petkova was involved in the excavations in the village of Odürtsi, which started as a Polish-Bulgarian project.<sup>408</sup> The so-called necropolis No. 2 was discovered in 1983/84,<sup>409</sup> but the first publication attributing this large cemetery to the Pechenegs appeared only in 1993.<sup>410</sup> Moreover, in a paper presented jointly with Stefka Angelova (1942–2009)<sup>411</sup> at the Second International Congress of Bulgarian Studies in 1986,

---

Lyudmila Doncheva-Petkova, “Mittelalterliche Tonkessel aus Bulgarien,” in *Die Keramik der Saltovo-Majaki*, 101–11.

404 Eadem, “Pamyatniki rannego srednevekov’ya v Yuzhnoy Dobrudzhe,” in *Trudy V Mezhdunarodnogo kongressa arkheologov-slavistov*, vol. 2, 243.

405 See: Dimitür Angelov, “Die bulgarischen Slawen und die Nomaden (VI–XII Jahrhundert),” *Pliska – Preslav* 3 (1981), 7–15; Zhivka Vūzharova, “Slavyani i nomadi na teritoriyata na dneshnite bŭlgarski zemi ot kraya na VI–XI v.,” *Pliska – Preslav* 3 (1981) 16–65.

406 Ibid., 62; Rasho Rashev, “Kŭsni nomadi v Pliskovskoto pole,” *Preslav* 3 (1983), 247–50. Rashev believed that there were a Pecheneg sanctuary and clan seat located in the vicinity of Pliska: Ibid., 244.

407 Georgi Atanasov, “Srednevekovni amuleti ot Silistra,” *INMV* 22 (1986), 74–81.

408 See: Stamen Michailov, Lyudmila Doncheva-Petkova and Dimitür Toptanov, “Fouilles archéologiques près du village Odârçi, département de Tolboukhine (Bulgarie) au cours des années 1971-1977 (partie orientale),” *Slavia Antiqua* 27 (1980–1981), 119–44; Urszula Dymaczewska and Aleksander Dymaczewski, “Résultats des fouilles archéologiques effectuées à Odârçi, département de Tolboukhine (Bulgarie), au cours des années 1967, 1969-1974 et 1976-1977 (partie occidentale),” *Slavia Antiqua* 27 (1980–1981), 145–71; Lyudmila Doncheva-Petkova, “Srednevekovnoto selishte pri s. Odürtsi, Tolbukhinski okrŭg,” *INMV* 17 (1981), 19–28; *Odürtsi*, 1, 5–6.

409 *Odürtsi*, 2, 9.

410 Eadem, “Srednevekoven nekropol pri selo Odürtsi, Dobrichko (predvaritelno sŭobshtenie),” *Dobrudzha* 10 (1993), 134–44.

411 Stefka Angelova (St Kliment Ohridski-University, Sofia) was long involved in the excavations on the medieval fortress and settlement at Durostorum (Drŭstŭr, Silistra). She first noted probable relics of Pecheneg presence there in her works “Krepostnata stena na Durostorum-Drŭstŭr-Silistra. (Predvaritelno sŭobshtenie),” *Arkheologiya* (1973), no. 3, 83–93 and “Razkopki na tsŭrkva No 2. Arkheologicheskoprochuvane na Drŭstŭr (14 godini po-kŭsno),” *Dobrudzha* 20 (2002), 12–39.

Doncheva-Petkova, though mentioning the necropolis (365 burials had been excavated by then), said nothing regarding its ethnic attribution. In the conclusions, the authors stated that “the population of Dobruja during this period remained mostly Bulgarian.”<sup>412</sup>

However, in the 1990s Doncheva-Petkova somewhat modified her views on the necropolis in Odürtsi: she came to believe that, as a result of a Pecheneg raid, the local settled population (which left behind the so-called necropolis No. 1 in the village of Odürtsi near Kaletu Hill) was forced to flee, and nomads settled there instead. Necropolis No. 2, referred to above, belonged to them.<sup>413</sup> The destruction of the local population’s settlement (1032 or 1036) was dated using the finds of anonymous folles of class B;<sup>414</sup> the appearance (1048–53) and abandonment (1070s–1080s, 1091 at the latest) of the necropolis No. 2 – based on the general testimony of Byzantine sources on the history of the Pechenegs in the Balkans.<sup>415</sup>

What were the arguments in favor of the Pecheneg provenance of the necropolis No. 2 near Odürtsi? No remnants of nomadic dwellings were preserved, as the nomads probably lived in yurts,<sup>416</sup> which are almost impossible to detect archaeologically. On the other hand, remains of two or three fire pits survived.<sup>417</sup> In addition to clay kettles, many items of horse harness, other objects of metal and bone, and personal ornaments turned up; Doncheva-Petkova viewed them as nomadic.

More traditional burials of later nomads (with horses or horse parts and weapons) have also been found in Bulgaria, especially at Pliska, the palace

412 Angelova and Doncheva-Petkova, “Süstavüt na naselenieto v Dobrudzha ot kraya na X do kraya na XI v.,” 381. In her 2005 monograph, Doncheva-Petkova writes that in the 1970s–1980s, even after the discovery of the necropolis No. 2, scholars working on Odürtsi were convinced that the Pechenegs left the area after sacking and destroying the farmers’ settlement: *Odürtsi*, 2, 164.

413 Doncheva-Petkova, “Srednovekovni nekropol pri selo Odürtsi, Dobrichko (predvaritelno süobshštenie);” Eadem, “A 11th Century Pechenegs’ Necropolis by Odarts Village, Dobrich District (North-Eastern Bulgaria),” *AB* 2 (1998), no. 3, 126–38; *Odürtsi*, 2, 161–74; Eadem, “Zur ethnischen Zugehörigkeit einiger Nekropolen des 11. Jahrhunderts in Bulgarien,” in *Byzantium, Pliska and the Balkans*, 643–60.

414 Veselin Parushev, “Molivdovuli i moneti,” in *Odürtsi*, 1, 134; Atanasov, “Anonimnyye vizantiyskiye follisy,” 114; *Odürtsi*, 2, 165.

415 *Ibid.*, 174.

416 Georgi Todorov writes that in Pliska nomads constructed dwellings of elliptical shape, using mostly clay: Todorov, “Vünshniyat grad na Pliska prez XI vek,” 79. The semi-dugouts at Drüstür are also considered Pecheneg: Angelova, “Razkopki na tsürkva No 2. Arkheologicheskoto prouchvane na Drüstür (14 godini po-küsno),” 14–6.

417 *Odürtsi*, 2, 164.

monastery in Preslav, Mednikarovo, Krivina, and other sites.<sup>418</sup> An entire complex of nomadic burials was discovered during the excavations of 2012–15 near the forum in ancient Thracian Philippopolis (modern Plovdiv).<sup>419</sup> Attempts to summarize the available information about Pecheneg and Cuman burials in Bulgaria were made by Uwe Fiedler<sup>420</sup> and later by Rumen Ivanov and Rosen Ivanov.<sup>421</sup>

Although the burials of the necropolis No. 2 near Odürtsi differ from those probably left behind by the Pechenegs in the North Pontic steppes and between the Volga and Don, Doncheva-Petkova still noted some shared features. These include west-east orientation, piles of stones over some of the burials, which, in her view, were supposed to imitate kurgans, the placing of human remains with their arms extended along the body, and bones of domestic animals (cows, sheep, horses, and pigs). Doncheva-Petkova cited the fact that the skeletons of the necropolis No. 2 belonged to Europeoids with some Mongoloid features as additional evidence in favor of attributing the site to the Pechenegs. 157 burials produced grave goods, including jewelry, knives, arrowheads, and accessories such as earrings, buckles, buttons, and appliquéés. These articles were of types found from the Volga to Dniester and Danube. There were also coins, the earliest from the Hellenistic era and the latest from the reign of Constantine IX Monomachos (1042–55).

As for the religious beliefs of the people who left these burials, finds of crosses and medallions with images of saints are evidence of the presence of Christian faith, while the character of other burials (including the orientation of remains, the ritual neutralization of the dead, traces of trepanation on skulls,

418 Ivan Zakhariev, “Yuzhnata krepostna stena na Pliska i nekropolüt do neya (razkopki prez 1971-1974 g.),” *Pliska – Preslav* 1 (1979), 137; Zhivka Vüzharova, “Slavyani i nomadi na teritoriyata na dneshnite bülgarski zemi ot kraya na VI–XI v.,” 31 and 55; Boris Borisov and Gergana Sheileva, “Arkheologicheski danni za küsnite nomadi na yug ot Balkana,” *Pliska – Preslav* 8 (2000), 248; Tonka Mikhailova, “Küsnonomadski grobove v Dvortsoviya tsentür na Pliska,” *Pliska – Preslav* 9 (2003), 259–66; Yanko Dimitrov, Khristina Stoyanova, “Zhilishta v iztochnata chast na taka narechenata ‘Tsitadela’ v Pliska (razkopki prez 1995–1996 g.),” in *Bülgarskite zemi prez srednevekovieto (VII–XVII v.). Mezhdunarodna konferentsiya v chest na 70-godishninata na prof. Aleksandür Kuzev*, eds. Valeri İotov and Plamen Pavlov (Varna: Arkheologicheski muzei, Varna, 2005), 131.

419 Ivanov, Ivanov and Tomov, *Srednovekoven nomadski nekropol ot Plovdiv (XI–XIII v.)*, 55–93; Rumen Ivanov, “Novi danni za pechenegite v Yuzhna Bülgariya,” *Dobrudzha* 30 (2015), 401–9.

420 Uwe Fiedler, “Zur Suche nach dem archäologischen Niederschlag von Petschenegen, Uzen und Kumanen in den Gebieten südlich der unteren Donau,” in *The Steppe Lands and the World Beyond Them*, 260–8.

421 Rumen Ivanov and Rosen Ivanov, *Pogrebalni obredi na pechenezi i kumani po bülgarskite zemi (XI–XIII v.)* (Plovdiv: Imeon, 2015).



and the accompanying inventory) indicates paganism or a syncretic, transitional belief system.<sup>422</sup> Doncheva-Petkova also repeatedly stressed the similarity of the burials near Odürtsi to other burials in Bulgaria (Pliska,<sup>423</sup> Preslav, Drüstür, Lovech, Staroselets, Dolno Sakhrane, etc.) and abroad – in Romania (Dinogetia, Isaccea), Hungary, Serbia, and North Macedonia (Demir Kapija, Matichane, Nish), especially in those regions where, according to Byzantine authors, Tyrach’s Pechenegs were settled.

Doncheva-Petkova noted very interesting parallels between the necropolis No. 2 near Odürtsi and the well-known burial ground at Hansca (Limbari-Căprăria) in the Republic of Moldova, namely the finds of open-loop earrings, round appliqué, a lyre-shaped buckle, iron loops, buttons, and iron knives.<sup>424</sup> She also pointed out that artifacts of the types found at Odürtsi occurred across a wide area – from Sarkel (the Don) to Hungary (the Danube) and from the upper Dniester to the Vardar River – in burials associated with diverse archaeological cultures and peoples, including the Hungarians and Slavs (the so-called Bjelo Brdo culture).<sup>425</sup>

Doncheva-Petkova’s “ethnic” identification of the necropolis in the village of Odürtsi as Pecheneg was based, among other things, on personal adornments such as figurines of horsemen (see above), spherical bells,<sup>426</sup> and leaf-shaped pendants.<sup>427</sup> Because the latter are found in large numbers, they have become

422 *Odürtsi*, 2, 166–7.

423 See: Lyudmila Doncheva-Petkova, “Pliska i pechenezite,” *Pliska – Preslav* 9 (2003), 244–58.

424 *Ibid.*, 169.

425 *Ibid.*, 170, Map on p. 171. A detailed criticism of the Pecheneg attribution of the necropolis No. 2 has been put forward by Florin Curta: Curta, “The Image and Archaeology of the Pechenegs.” Uwe Fiedler questions the nomadic interpretation of the burials at Odürtsi, because at least four out of five graves do not conform to the traditional nomadic ritual, and because of the absence of characteristically Pecheneg scissors south of the Danube: Fiedler, “Zur Suche nach dem archäologischen Niederschlag von Petschenegen,” 267–8. Evgeniya Komatarova-Balinova disputes the entire complex of Doncheva-Petkova’s “Pecheneg” artifacts: Evgeniya Komatarova-Balinova, “The ‘Pechenegs’ from Pliska and Odartsı and Their ‘Amulete’-Riders,” in *Mikheyevs’ki chytannya*, eds. Victor S. Aksyonov and Volodymyr V. Koloda (Kharkiv: Maydan, 2019), 66–78.

426 Yanko Dimitrov, “Tsürkva i nekropol vŭv Vŭnshniya grad na Pliska (kraya na X–XI v.),” *Pliska – Preslav* 7 (1995), 65–6, Fig. 6. There is a special study by Stanislav Stanilov devoted to the bell-shaped ornaments, in which he links at least a proportion of these finds to the late nomads: Stanislav Stanilov, “Polovin zvŭnets (prinos kŭm prouchvaneto na starobŭlgarskite zvŭnyashti amuleti ot VII–XI v.),” in *Bŭlgarskite zemı prez srednevekovieto (VII–XVII v.)*. *Mezhdunarodna konferentsiya v chest na 70-godishninata na prof. Aleksandŭr Kuzev*, 29–40.

427 Also interpreted as “trees of life,” lizards, or birds with outspread wings; there is no single interpretation of the functional purpose of these objects, variously seen as earpicks, female jewelry, or *reshmas*, horse ornaments: Svetlana O. Ryabtseva, “O listovidnykh

the subject of numerous publications.<sup>428</sup> In Bulgarian historiography, these adornments have been specially considered by Valeri Īotov (Varna Museum of Archaeology),<sup>429</sup> Īoto Valeriev (Burgas Museum of History),<sup>430</sup> Teodora Krumova,<sup>431</sup> and Boyan Totev (Dobrich Museum of History).<sup>432</sup> Georgi Vladimirov published a study of Cuman jewelry.<sup>433</sup>

The importance and value of archaeological studies (both fieldwork and further interpretation of discovered materials) lies in the fact that they not only illustrate what is already known to historians from the written sources (often archaeological sources contradict written ones), but also provide new

---

ukrasheniyakh, podveskakh, kopoushkakh i reshmakh," *Revista Arheologică* (2005), no. 1, 350–8.

- 428 Īoto Valeriev surveys the literature in his article "Kŭsnonomadski pandantivi amuleti ot raiona na Dolniya Dunav," in *V poiskakh sushchnosti: Sbornik statey v chest' 60-letiya N. D. Russeva*, eds. Mark Tkachuk and Georgi Atanasov (Chiŭinău: Stratum Plus, 2019), 125–45. Overall, most researchers consider these decorations, if not Pecheneg, at least late-nomadic. Florin Curta stresses that the finds from the Carpathian-Danubian region are of local origin and represent not so much ethnic markers as a "Pecheneg" fashion: Curta, "Obraz i arkeologiya pechenegov," 215.
- 429 Valeri Īotov, "O material'noy kul'ture pechenegov k yugu ot Dunaya – listovidnyye azhurnyye amulety XI v.," *Stratum plus* (2000), no. 5, 209–12. Valeri Īotov co-authored (with Georgi Atanasov) an archaeological monograph on the medieval fortress of Skala, which produced finds linked to Pecheneg presence. In the authors' view, the fortress was burned down in the Pecheneg raid of 1036, and the nomads put up a temporary camp there (as evidenced by fragments of clay kettles, bells, and a filigree amulet): Īotov and Atanasov, *Skala. Krepost ot X–XI v. do s. Kladentsi, Tervelsko*, 137. In 2004, Īotov published a catalog of medieval weapons found in Bulgaria: *Vŭorŭzhenieto i snaryazhenieto ot bŭlgarskoto srednovekovie (VII–XI v.)* (Varna: Zograf, 2004); he has also written on the problem of the sabers of so-called "Hungarian" and "late-nomadic" types, as well as on numismatic questions: Valeri Īotov, "Mechi Vizantii i sabli kochevnikov (VIII–XII vv.) na Nizhnem Dunaye," in *Istochniki po istorii kochevnikov*, 50–2.
- 430 Īoto Valeriev, "Kŭsnonomadski pandantivi amuleti ot raiona na Dolniya Dunav." The article was first published in Shumen in 2015.
- 431 Krumova, "Pechenezhskiy pamyatniki v Severo-Vostochnoy Bolgarii."
- 432 Boyan Totev and Olga Pelevina, "Rannesrednevekovyye zerkala iz basseyna Nizhnego Dunaya," in *Istochniki po istorii kochevnikov*, 79–81. The authors consider a special type of late-nomadic mirrors.
- 433 Georgi Vladimirov, "Ser'gi v vide znaka voprosa iz Dunayskoy Bolgarii (XIII–XIV vv.): proiskhozhdeniye i areal rasprostraneniya," *Povolzhskaya Arkheologiya* 7 (2014), no. 1, 224–33. Vladimirov also attempted to sum up all known material traces of Cuman presence in Bulgaria: Idem, "Material'nyye sledy kumanov v Bolgarskikh zemlyakh (konets XI–seredina XIII v.): problemy izucheniya," *Povolzhskaya Arkheologiya* 9 (2014), no. 3, 242–55.

information, new knowledge about the past.<sup>434</sup> Often, the testimony of written sources requires confirmation.<sup>435</sup>

Clay kettles, weapons, horse harness, or jewelry generally do not bear the names of their manufacturers;<sup>436</sup> medieval seals, on the other hand, not infrequently do. In 1992, Ivan Īordanov of the Byzantine Center at the Constantine of Preslav University of Shumen published a seal found at Drūstūr,<sup>437</sup> which belonged to the Pecheneg chieftain Kegen and bore his title and “office”

434 At least in the case of the Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans on the Lower Danube, the German archaeologist Uwe Fiedler believes this is possible: Fiedler, “Zur Suche nach dem archäologischen Niederschlag von Petschenegen,” 250.

435 For instance, Igor’ Danilevskii notes a similarity between the stories of the murder of Prince Sviatoslav by the Pechenegs (*Primary Chronicle*) and that of Emperor Nikephoros I by the Bulgarians (Constantine Manasses and Georgios Hamartolos), as well as a resemblance between what reportedly happened to Prince Sviatoslav and certain biblical stories: Igor’ N. Danilevskii, *Povest’ vremennykh let: Germenevicheskiye osnovy izucheniya letopisnykh tekstov* (Moscow: Izdatel’stvo Olega Abyshko, 2004), 124–5, 162–7. Florin Curta writes about “traces” of the works of Herodotus, Agathias, and other early authors in 11th- and 12th-century Byzantine descriptions of the Pechenegs: Curta, “The Image and Archaeology of the Pechenegs,” 143–7; Idem, *Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages (500-1300)*, vol. 1, 25–6. Komatarova-Balinova does not see Michael Psellos’ “Mysians” as Pechenegs: Komatarova-Balinova, “The ‘Pechenegs’ from Pliska and Odartsi and Their ‘Amulete’-Riders,” 66.

436 An exception is the Carolingian sword found near the village of Hvoshcheve in Ukraine (today in Poltava region), bearing a Cyrillic inscription that translates as “Ljudota/Ljudosha the smith.” See: Anatoliĭ N. Kirpichnikov, *Drevnerusskoye oruzhiye*, vol. 1, *Mechi i sabli IX–XIII v.* (Moscow/Leningrad: Nauka, 1966), 37. Fedir Androshchuk interprets the find in Fedir Androshchuk, “The ‘Ljudota Sword’? (An Episode of Contacts between Britain and Scandinavia in the Late Viking Age),” in *Ruthenica*, vol. 2, eds. Volodymyr Rychka and Oleksiĭ Tolochko (Kyiv, 2003), 15–25.

437 Īordanov, “Sceau d’archonte de PATZINAKIA du XIe siècle.” See also: Idem, “Pechati na Īoan Kegen, magistūr i arkhont na Pechenegiya (1050–1051),” *Numizmatika i sfragistika* (1998), no. 1–2, 96–102; *Corpus of Byzantine Seals from Bulgaria*, vol. 1, *Byzantine Seals with Geographical Names*, ed. Ivan Īordanov (Sofia: Agato Publishers, 2003), 138–42. The reconstructed inscription reads: “Κύριε βοήθει Ἰωάννη μαγίστρῳ καὶ ἄρχοντι Πατζινακίας τῷ Κεγένῃ” [Lord aid Ioannes Kegenes, *magistros* and *archon* of Patzinakia]. The inscription on the seal from Drūstūr can be better understood thanks to the publication in 1997 of the catalog of an exhibition of Byzantine seals in Bode-Museum in Berlin by Werner Seibt and Marie Luise Zarnitz. The catalog included a seal from a private collection whose place of origin was unknown, but which bore the clearly readable name “Kegen”: Werner Seibt and Marie Luise Zarnitz, *Das byzantinische Bleisiegel als Kunstwerk: Katalog zur Ausstellung* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1997), 131–2.

(*magistros*<sup>438</sup> and *archon*<sup>439</sup>) as well as the name of the land he ruled – Patzinakia. In 1994, Georgi Atanasov and Ivan Īordanov published another Byzantine seal, found near the village of Vetren, 25 km west of Drŭstŭr, which possibly mentions Kegen’s rival in the struggle for power over the Pechenegs

- 438 The title of *magistros* derives from the early Byzantine *magister officiorum*. In the middle-Byzantine period, this title ranked fifth in the Byzantine hierarchy; its importance somewhat dwindled in the 11th to 12th centuries. In the mid-11th century, the title of *magistros* was borne, for example, by the governors of Antioch, such as Romanos Skleros and Constantine Bourtze (*Catalogue of Byzantine Seals at Dumbarton Oaks and in the Fogg Museum of Art*, vol. 5, *The East (continued), Constantinople and Environs, Unknown Locations, Addenda, Uncertain Readings*, eds. Eric McGeer et al., 21), the future emperors Constantine Doukas (his seal with the title of *magistros* is preserved at Dumbarton Oaks, accession number BZS.1947.2.1136) and Nikephoros Botaneiates (before 1062, “Κ(ὐρι)ε β(σῆ)θ(ει) Νικηφόρ(ω) [μ]α[γ]ίστρο, βέστη, βεστάρχ(η),” Dumbarton Oaks, accession number BZS.1951.31.5.175), as well as some foreign rulers (Doge Domenico I Contarini; Gagik II, king of Ani; and emir of Sicily Abulafar Muhammad: Skabalanovich, *Vizantijskoye gosudarstvo i tserkov’ v’ XI vĕkĕ*, 153). In the 10th century, a *magistros* received a *βόγα* (cash salary) of 24 pounds gold; in the 11th century – 16 pounds. See also: Födor Uspenskii, “Vizantijskaya tabel’ o rangakh,” *Izvestiya Russkogo arkeologicheskogo instituta v Konstantinopole* 3 (1898), 98–137; Constantine Porphyrogenetos, *The Book of Ceremonies*, ed. and transl. Anne Moffatt and Maxeme Tall (Canberra: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies, 2012), 231–6.
- 439 The *Taktikon* of the 9th century (842–843) (the so-called *Taktikon of Uspenskii*, see: Uspenskii, “Vizantijskaya tabel’ o rangakh”) contains a list of the *archontes* (that is, rulers) of Crete, Dalmatia, and Cyprus. There is also an 11th-century seal with an inscription in which a Rus’ prince is referred to as an *archontes* (Κύριε βοήθει τῷ σῷ δούλῳ Ἀνδρέᾳ ἀρχοντι πάσης Ρωσίας): Alexandr V. Soloviev, “ΑΡΧΩΝ ΡΩΣΙΑΣ,” *Byzantion* 31 (1961), 237–44. As in the case of ἄρχων Ρωσίας, the term ἄρχων Πατρίνακίας may mean the ruler of a sovereign territory (see, for instance, Lubomira Havlíková, “L’influence de la théorie politique byzantine sur la tradition étatique des Bulgares: Contribution au problème des titres et des symboles de souverains,” *BS* 60 (1999), 41). Chapter 48 of the *De Ceremoniis* lists among the rulers who receive letters (*grammata*) with a two-solidi gold seal the *archontes* of Iberia, Alania, Sardinia, Rhosia, and the “archon[te]s of the Patzinaks”: Constantine Porphyrogenetos, *The Book of Ceremonies*, 691; Jadran Ferluga, “Die Adressenliste für auswärtige Herrscher aus dem Zeremonienbuch Konstantin Porphyrogenetos,” *ZRVI* 12 (1970), 157–78. The *DAI* also speaks of the rulers of the land of the Pechenegs north of the Black Sea as great (*megaloi*) *archontes*: Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Administrando Imperio*, 1, 166. However, as with the title of *magistros*, by the mid-11th century the term ἄρχων may have denoted the representative of the Byzantine government in a region, rather than the ruler of a sovereign territory as it did in the *De Ceremoniis* (as was the case with “Leo archon of Loupadion,” seal BZS.1958.106.4386, Dumbarton Oaks; or “Michael spatharokandidatos, imperial notarios and archon of Nicaea,” seal BZS.1951.31.5.2634, Dumbarton Oaks). Skylitzes writes that Kegen was granted the title of *patrikios* (*Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsis historiarum*, 456). See also: Jarosław Dudek, “Pieczęć magistra Jana Kegeny jako wyraz polityki Bizancjum wobec stepowców w połowie XI w.,” *Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis. Historia* 171 (2005), 332–3.

and competition for Byzantine favor – the “protospatharios and ep[archos] Ty[rach] (?)”<sup>440</sup> In 2002, Jean-Claude Cheynet described a seal with a clearly readable name (Ioannes Tyrach) and titles (*patrikios* and *strategos*).<sup>441</sup> Īordanov also published the two known seals of another prominent “Scythian” in Byzantine service – Argyros Karatzas.<sup>442</sup>

Ivan Īordanov started out as a specialist in medieval numismatics.<sup>443</sup> In an early article, he linked the origin of a hoard of Byzantine coins near the village of Vetren in eastern Bulgaria with the 1087 campaign of the imperial army against the Pechenegs of Khan Chelgu, during which the nomads suffered heavy defeat near the fortress of Pamphylon.<sup>444</sup> Another study of his<sup>445</sup> prompted Oberländer-Tärnoveanu and Mănuclu-Adameşteanu to hypothesize the existence of a local minting center in Dobruja and, as a result, helped raise

440 Atanasov and Īordanov, *Srednovkovniyat Vetren na Dunav*, 41, Table XIII (pic. 118). The authors reconstructed the inscription on the seal thus: [+K(ύρι)ε β(ού)θ(ει) Τυ]ράχχ | Τουτάχχ (πρωτο)σπαθαρίω και ἐπ[άρχω] (Lord aid Tyrach | Toutach, protospatharios and eparchos): *Ibid.*, 63. The name and full title of the seal’s owner are illegible. In the 10th century, the title of *protospatharios* was granted to commanders of *themes*; the *protospatharios* of the *basilikoi anthrōpoi* had military functions (Alexandr P. Kazhdan, “Protospatharios,” in *ODB*, 3, 1748). In the 11th century, this title was borne, for instance, by Romanos Dalassenos, governor of Iberia (seal BZS.1958.106.1945, Dumbarton Oaks). As for the probable title of *eparchos*, in the seal collection at Dumbarton Oaks the combination of *protospatharios* and *eparchos* is found only in reference to the governors of Constantinople in the 9th to 10th centuries (seals BZS.1955.11521 and BZS.1951.31.5.2703).

441 Jean-Claude Cheynet, “Par St Georges, par St Michel,” *Travaux et Mémoires* 14 (2002), 128 (fig. 25 seal 58.106.5725, Dumbarton Oaks). The reconstructed inscription reads: “Κύριε βοήθει τῷ σῷ δούλῳ Ἰωάννῃ πατρικίῳ και στρατηγῷ τῷ Τυράχχ” [Lord aid your servant Ioannes Tyrach, patrikios and strategos]. Interestingly, the same titles (*patrikios* and *strategos*) were borne by the Byzantine governor of Cherson Ioannes Bogas (Ἰωάννης Βογᾶς, Dumbarton Oaks accession number BZS.1958.106.4036), a 10th-century official of probably Pecheneg origin who negotiated with the Pechenegs regarding military assistance against the Bulgarian ruler Simeon: Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, 2, 92. In the 11th century, this title was commonly associated with the military government of certain fortresses (the fortress of Kama – an official by the name of Niketas, Dumbarton Oaks seal BZS.1958.106.828; Zebel/Gabala – Eustratios Botaneiates, seal BZS.1951.31.5.874) or regions (Constantine, *theme* Opsikion, Dumbarton Oaks accession number BZS.1958.106.4510; Ioannes Skleros, *theme* Peloponnesos, seal BZS.1951.31.5.1047).

442 Īordanov, “Byzantine lead seals from the stronghold near Dobri Dol, Plovdiv region,” 450–1.

443 *Opus magnum*: Ivan Īordanov, *Moneti i monetno obrūshenie v Srednovkovna Būlgariya 1081–1261 g.* (Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 1984).

444 Idem, “Monetnata reforma na Aleksii I Komnin (1081–1118) v svetlinata na numizmaticheski nakhodki ot Iztochna Būlgariya,” *Arkheologiya* (1978), no. 1, 7–12.

445 Idem, “Ranni formi na monetno proizvodstvo (X–XII v.) v būlgarskite zemi,” *Numizmatika* (1980), no. 2, 4–15.

the question of the political reasons for the establishment of such a center, specifically the nomadic dominance in the northeastern part of the *theme* of Bulgaria and most of the *theme* of Paristrion in the second half of the 11th century. Based on Īordanov's observations on the circulation of Byzantine coins in Preslav, we can conclude that it was destroyed by Tyrach's Pechenegs in 1047.<sup>446</sup>

During excavations at Preslav in 1978, a large archive of Byzantine seals, including more than 500 lead seals, 250 lead blanks, and 4 moulds was unearthed. This forced Ivan Īordanov, in his own words, to retrain from numismatist to sigillographer, eventually cataloging approximately 3500 Byzantine seals, 800 lead blanks, twenty moulds for casting, and two boulloteria dating to between 829 and 1087.<sup>447</sup> His unique combination of the knowledge of Byzantine numismatics and sigillography allowed Īordanov to offer valuable observations on the administrative organization of Byzantium's Balkan possessions.<sup>448</sup>

The importance of sigillography as a discipline capable of generating new knowledge is well illustrated by Īordanov's study "Seals of Characters from the *Alexiad* Found in Veliki Preslav."<sup>449</sup> The author examines seals of persons

- 
- 446 Idem, "Etablissement administratif byzantin à Preslav aux Xe–XIe s.," *JÖB* 32 (1982), no. 2, 41.
- 447 Idem, "Pechati deyateley iz 'Aleksiady', naydenmyye v Veliki-Preslave," *Vestnik VolGU. Istoriya. Regionovedeniye. Mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya* 21 (2016), 19–20; Idem, "The Lead Seals of *epi tou manglaviou* from Bulgaria," *Antichnaya drevnost' i sredniye veka* (2009), 171. Catalogues: Idem, *Pechatite ot strategiyata v Preslav (971-1088)* (Sofia: Universitetsko izdatelstvo "Sv. Kliment Ohridski," 1993); Idem, *Korpus na pechatite na Srednovkovna Bŭlgariya* (Sofia: Agato, 2001); Idem, *Corpus of Byzantine Seals from Bulgaria*, vol. 1; vol. 2, *Byzantine seals with family names* (Sofia: Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, 2006); vol. 3 (part 1–2) (Sofia: Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, 2009).
- 448 Idem, "Dobrudza (491-1092) – selon les données de la numismatique et de la sphragistique," in *Dobrudža: Études ethno-culturelles*, 182–207; Ivan Īordanov and Vasilka Tŭpkova-Zaimova, "Quelques nouvelles données sur l'administration byzantine au Bas Danube (fin du Xe–XIe s.)," in *Géographie historique du monde méditerranéen*, ed. Hélène Ahrweiler (Paris: Éditions de la Sorbonne, 1988), 119–26. Dimitŭr Stoimenov (Archives State Agency, Bulgaria) also made important contributions to this subject: Dimitŭr Stoimenov, "Vremenna vizantiiska voenna administratsiya v bŭlgarskite zemi (971-987/989)," *GSUIF* 82 (1988), no. 2, 39–66; Idem, "Za molivdovulite na Katakalon 'Strateg na İonanopol'," *Arkheologiya* (1996), no. 2–3, 84; Idem, "The Katepanate of Paradounavon according to the Sphragistic Data," *SBS* 8 (2003), 63–73; Idem, "Molivdovul na neizvesten strateg na Filipopol," in *Istoriya i knigite kato priyatelstvo. Sbornik v pamet na Mitko Lachev*, eds. Nadia Danova et al. (Sofia: Gutenberg, 2007), 54–5. See also: Peter Frankopan, "The Working of Byzantine Provincial Administration in the 10th–12th Centuries: The Example of Preslav," *Byzantion* 71 (2001), no. 1, 73–97.
- 449 Cf.: Valentina S. Shandrovskaia, "Nekotoryye istoricheskiye deyateli 'Aleksiady' i ikh pechatii," *Palestinskiy sbornik* 23 (1971), 28–45.

mentioned in the *Alexiad* and identifies a group of seals from the 1080s–1090s belonging to about 20 individuals not mentioned in any written sources. All of them corresponded with the commander of the Byzantine garrison at Preslav, probably in 1087, when troops were stationed there as part of a campaign against the Pechenegs. After the defeat of the Byzantine army near Drüstür, Preslav was abandoned by the Byzantine administration.<sup>450</sup> Īordanov has also published an interesting article on the prosopography of the Battle of Acheloos.<sup>451</sup>

Coins are no less informative than seals.<sup>452</sup> Assuming that nomadic attacks correlate with increased hoarding of coins and valuables and with coin deposits in layers marked by fires and destruction, and that sharp falls in the quantity of coins of certain years means the abandonment of a settlement by its residents, it is clear that numismatic materials discovered in the lands of modern Bulgaria, Romania, and Serbia add considerably to what we already know from the written sources.

In 1991, Georgi Atanasov<sup>453</sup> published a seminal work on the “Ethnic and Demographic Changes in Dobruja (10th to 16th centuries).”<sup>454</sup> Based on archaeological evidence, he argued that by the mid-10th century Dobruja and northeastern Bulgaria were densely populated, boasting 30 stone fortresses and about 280 unfortified villages. According to Atanasov, the network of settlements was especially dense in the Black Sea region (between Varna and

---

450 Īordanov, “Pechati deyateley iz ‘Aleksiady’, naydennyye v Veliki-Preslave.”

451 Idem, “Bitkata pri Akheloĭ prez 917 g.: Chislenost i sŭstav na vizantiĭskata armiya. Prosopografiya na uchastnitsite (Prinosŭt na sfragistikata),” in *Simeonova Bŭlgariya*, 33–60.

452 Īoto Valeriev, “Kŭm istoriyata i arkeologiyata na zemite na Dolniya Dunav prez Srednovekovieto: sbornite monetni nakhodki ot teritoriyata na Bŭlgariya, Sŭrbiya i Rumŭniya (969–1180),” *Dobrudzha* 24–25 (2013), 381–460.

453 Georgi Atanasov is the director of the Silistra Museum. He has done archaeological work at Drŭstŭr, Skala, Okorsh, Ruyno, and other sites. His main spheres of interest are Christian archaeology (in 1990, he defended a dissertation on “Rock Monasteries in Dobruja, 5th to 15th Centuries”) and the history and archaeology of the medieval city of Drŭstŭr and the region of Dobruja.

454 Atanasov, “Etnodemografski promeni v Dobrudzha (X–XVI v.),” 75–89. He further developed his theory in subsequent works: Idem, “Pogled kŭm dobrudzhanskiya dunavski bryag ot XI do XV v.,” *IstPreg* (1992), no. 8–9, 13–31; Idem, “Etnodemografski i etnokulturni promeni po Dobrudzhanskoto chernomorie prez srednovekovieto,” *IstPreg* (1996), no. 2, 3–30; Idem, “Nov pogled kŭm demografskite i etnokulturnite promeni v Dobrudzha prez Srednovekovieto,” in *Izsledvaniya v chest na chl. kor. prof. Strashimir Dimitrov*, eds. Vŭrban Todorov et al. (Sofia: Académie des sciences de Bulgarie, 2001), 185–214.

Kaliakra), along the Danube (especially around Drüstür),<sup>455</sup> in the canyons of the rivers Kanagyol (Romanian Canora) and Sukha Reka, and near the so-called Stone Dyke in Dobruja. As a result of the ruinous war of 968–971, almost all of the unfortified settlements of inner Dobruja and some along the Black Sea coast and the Danube were abandoned, and life continued mainly in fortresses, such as Skala and Tsar Asen. However, the Pecheneg attacks of 1036 and 1048, the Uz raids of 1064, the wars of 1087–88, the Cuman invasion of 1095, and various natural disasters (earthquakes and a prolonged period without rainfall) devastated these fortifications as well. After that, the entire region except for a few fortresses (Drüstür, Vetren, Tutrakan, Păcuilui lui Soare, Kiliya, and some others) remained depopulated for as long as five centuries.<sup>456</sup> For dating, these conclusions relied mostly on coin finds.

In 1999, Atanasov came out with a paper aiming to solve two problems at once – the dating of the anonymous Byzantine folles of class B<sup>457</sup> and the

455 In 2010, Atanasov, in collaboration with Nikolai Russev (Chişinău), presented his view of the history of the lands north of the Danube in the 7th to 10th centuries. According to the authors, in the late 9th to 10th centuries the Bulgarian tsar Simeon (aiming to create a threat to Byzantium) resettled the Bulgarian population from the North Pontic steppes to Dobruja and the land between the Danube and Trajan's Wall. The relocation is archaeologically attested by the peaceful disappearance of many settlements of the Dridu culture (which Atanasov and Russev consider Bulgarian). The depopulated lands north of the Danube and Trajan's Wall were left to the Pechenegs: Georgi Atanasov and Nikolai Russev, "Onglos: Pervaya rezidentsiya bolgarskikh kanov na Nizhnem Dunaye i bolgarskoye prisutstviye severneye Dunaya v VII–X vv.," in *Bolgarskiy Forum I. Materialy Mezhdunarodnogo Bolgarskogo Foruma (19–21 iyunya 2010 g., Bolgar)*, 30. Atanasov set forth this idea for the first time as early as 2001: Atanasov, "Nov pogled kŭm demografkite i etnokulturnite promeni v Dobrudzha prez Srednovekovieto," 188–90. For a critique of the views of those Romanian historians who assert that the population of Dobruja in the middle-Byzantine period was not Bulgarian, see: Ivan Bozhilov, "Etnicheska kartina, selishta i stopanska deĭnost," in Ivan Bozhilov and Vasil Gyuzelev, *Istoriya na Dobrudzha*, vol. 2, *Srednovekovie* (Veliko Tarnovo: Faber, 2004), 170–4. In Bozhilov's view, as of the mid-10th century, the steppe lands between the Prut and Dniester were part of the Bulgarian state, and the Dniester served as Bulgaria's border with Pechenegia: Ivan Bozhilov, "Bŭlgariya i pechenezite (896–1018)," *IstPreg* (1973), no. 2, 55–9.

456 Idem, Georgi Atanasov, *Dobrudzhanskoto despotstvo*, 13–7. Chavdar Kirilov and Kamen Stanev have also taken part in the discussion surrounding the depopulation of entire regions in the 11th to 15th centuries (see above). Based on the discovery of the seal of Georgios Teodorokanos, İoto Valeriev questions the depopulation of the inner areas of Dobruja as a result of the Pecheneg raids of 1032–36: İoto Valeriev, "Oloven pechat na Georgi Teodorokan, protokuropalat, ot raiona na kŭsnoantichniya grad Zaldapa," *Dobrudzha* 30 (2015), 467–8.

457 The follis is a Byzantine copper coin weighing 14 to 3 grams (during the 8th to 11th centuries). The so-called "anonymous folles" were minted from the era of Ioannes Tzimiskes (969–976), who replaced the portrait of the emperor on these coins with the image



timing and routes of the Pecheneg raids of the first half of the 11th century.<sup>458</sup> While Petre Diaconu had considered Pecheneg raids mainly through the prism of the materials yielded by the Byzantine fortresses along the Danube, such as those at Capidava, Dinogetia, Păcuilul lui Soare, and others, Atanasov made extensive use of the results of the 1970s–1980s excavations by Romanian and Bulgarian archaeologists in the inner parts of Dobruja. He sketched out the hypothetical routes of the Pecheneg raids of 1027, 1032, 1034, 1035, and 1036. In his view, in 1027 the Pechenegs struck only the *theme* of Bulgaria, devastating the areas of Vidin, Belgrade, Branichevo, and Nish. In 1032, they invaded all of Moesia down to Saloniki. On their way, the nomads crossed the Danube in northwestern Bulgaria, traversed the Balkans along the longitude of Sofia, and continued along the Struma River. The following year, Thrace and Macedonia were also attacked, while Dobruja east of the Dorostolon-Pliska line escaped unharmed. According to Atanasov, Dobruja became the target of Pecheneg attack only in 1036,<sup>459</sup> when the Byzantine fortresses of Skala, Tsar Asen, Dorostolon, Dinogetia, and Hârşova were destroyed.

Drawing mainly on numismatic evidence, Atanasov suggested that the fortresses of Nufăru, Capidava, and Balchik survived the 1036 raids.<sup>460</sup> Those fortresses that had a maritime or riverine connection with the imperial center either remained intact or were not completely destroyed; life there resumed shortly after the Pechenegs left Dobruja, which was no later than September 1036.

As for the dating of the anonymous folles, Atanasov concluded that the absence of class C folles (dated by David Metcalf to 1034–41) and extremely low occurrence of class B folles (1028–34 according to Metcalf) in the Byzantine fortresses destroyed in the Pecheneg raids of 1036 argued against the dating

---

of Christ and the inscription “Jesus Christ, the ruler of him who rules,” and until the monetary reform of Alexios I Komnenos in 1092: Philip Grierson, *Byzantine Coinage* (Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1999), 21.

458 Georgi Atanasov, “Otkoga zapochva secheneto na anonimnite vizantijski folisi klas ‘B’ i koga pechenegite opustoshavat Dobrudzha,” *Numizmatichni izsledvaniya* (1999), no. 3–4, 33–53; Idem, “Anonimnyye vizantiyskiye follisy”; Idem, “De nouveau pour la date initiale de folles byzantines anonymes classe ‘B,’” in *Sphragistic and Epigraphic Contributions to the History of the Black Sea Coast* (Acta Musei Varnaensis, 2), eds. Valeri Iotov et al. (Varna: Arkheologicheski muzei, Varna, 2004), 289–98.

459 Atanasov, “Anonimnyye vizantiyskiye follisy,” 111–15.

460 Diaconu believed that only the fortress of Păcuilul lui Soare survived: Diaconu, *Les Petchénègues au Bas-Danube*, 49.

proposed by Metcalf and in favor of that by Grierson, but with the start date moved by the Bulgarian archaeologist to 1034/35 instead of 1030.<sup>461</sup>

The events of 1046–47 are marked by the absence of class D folles at Vetren and a fall in their quantity at Capidava and Dinogetia.<sup>462</sup> The hoard of high-value coins found near the village of Gigen might be a confirmation of the generous fee received by the Pechenegs for their participation in the fighting against the Seljuks (or evidence of the wars of Kegen and Tyrach).<sup>463</sup> The absence of coins of the relevant period and seals in Pliska suggests that it was destroyed during the Uz invasion of 1064–67.<sup>464</sup> The six hoards of copper

461 Atanasov, “Anonimnyye vizantiyskiye follisy,” 118. These arguments were generally supported by Igor Lazarenko (Varna Regional Museum of History): Igor Lazarenko, “Kolektivna monetna nakhodka ot vizantiiski folisi klas A-2, namerena mezhdu selata Planinitsa i Rupcha, Burgaska oblast,” in *Trakiya i Kheminont. IV–XIV v.*, vol. 1 (Varna: Zograf, 2007), 203. Veselin Parushev (Dobrich Regional Museum of History) proposes 1032 instead of 1036: Parushev, “Molivdovuli i moneti,” 134. See also his “Nepublikovani srednovekovni moneti ot Yuzhna Dobrudzha (VIII–XIV v.),” *Dobrudzha* 10 (1993), 145–67; Idem, “Nesüobshteni monetni sükrovishta ot Yuzhna Dobrudzha,” *Dobrudzha* 17–18 (2000), 73–82. Vujadin Ivanišević distinguishes between the raid of 1034 and that of 1035–36: Vujadin Ivanišević, “Optičaj vizantijskih folisa XI veka na prostoru Centralnog Balkana,” *Numizmatičar* 16 ((1993), 84). Ito Valeriev believes that the raid of 1036 did not affect northern Bulgaria: Ito Valeriev, “Küm istoriyata i arkhologiyata na zemite na Dolniya Dunav prez Srednovekovieto: sbornite monetni nakhodki ot teritoriyata na Bülğariya, Sürbiya i Rumüniya (969–1180),” 389. Mănuțu-Adameșteanu is also critical of the existing chronology and hypothetical routes of the Pecheneg raids (see above). Valeri Grigorov notes that 47 coins were found in Pliska in 2011–14, ten of which were folles of class B and only one – of class D: Valeri Grigorov, “Moneti ot obekt ‘Dvortsov tsentür – iztok’ v Pliska,” *Numizmatika, Sfragistika i Epigrafika* 13 (2017), 203–18. In addition to the above-mentioned scholars, substantial contributions to Bulgarian numismatics were made by Nikola Mushmov (1869–1942), Todor Gerasimov (1903–74), Īordanka Yurukova (1935–2012), and Vladimir Penchev: Todor Gerasimov, *Antichni i srednovekovni moneti v Bülğariya* (Sofia, 1975); Vladimir Penchev, “Dve kolektivni monetni nakhodki ot XI v., namereni pri arkhologicheskite razkopki na srednovekovniya Drüstür,” *Numizmatika* 24 (1990), no. 3, 28–31; Idem, “Kolektivna nakhodka süs secheni vüv Filipopol bilonovi skifati na Aleksii I Komnin,” *Numizmatika, sfragistika i epigrafika* (2005), no. 2, 101–6; Īordanka Yurukova and Vladimir Penchev, *Bülğarski srednovekovni pečati i moneti* (Sofia, 1990).

462 Valeriev, “Küm istoriyata i arkhologiyata na zemite na Dolniya Dunav,” 392–3.

463 Vladimir Penchev, “Kolektivna nakhoda s vizantiiski miliarenzii ot X-XI v., namerena kraï selo Gigen, Nikopolsko,” *Numizmatika i sfragistika* 5 (1998), 76–95. Kamen Stanev believes that this hoard marks the location of the camp of the Pecheneg chieftain Selte in 1059, because fragments of kettles with inside ears and two Pecheneg amulets were found near it: Kamen Stanev, “Vüzstanovyavaneto na vizantiiskata vlast v Paristrion prez 1059 g. i proizkhoda na imeto Nikopol,” *Minalo* (2003), no. 3, 23.

464 Valeriev, “Küm istoriyata i arkhologiyata na zemite na Dolniya Dunav,” 394.

coins in Drüstŭr<sup>465</sup> and the hoard of gold found near the modern village of Professor Ishirkovo<sup>466</sup> may be relics of the wars of Alexios I Komnenos against the Pechenegs in 1087–91. Many other coin and seal finds have been linked to the restoration of Byzantine rule on the Danube in the late 11th century.<sup>467</sup>

#### 4.2 *Medieval and Byzantine Studies*

While Bulgarian medieval archaeology to a certain extent “lagged behind” its Romanian counterpart for some decades, in the publication of medieval written sources Bulgarian scholars outperformed not only the Romanians but also their colleagues from the rest of Southeastern Europe.

In 1954, the Institute of History at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences began publishing the *Fontes Historiae Bulgaricae* (*FHB*) – a series dedicated to sources for the history of Bulgaria from antiquity to 1877 in non-Slavic languages, with translations into Bulgarian. The editions were notable for their convenient scholarly apparatus, which included, in addition to extended commentaries, information on the creation and publication history of the texts and detailed bibliographies.<sup>468</sup> Of the greatest interest to us are two subseries, the *Grŭtski izvori za bŭlgarskata istoriya* (*GIBI*) and *Latinski izvori za bŭlgarskata istoriya* (*LIBI*).<sup>469</sup> The Bulgarian series of translated Greek sources for the history of

465 Penchev, “Dve kolektivni monetni nakhodki ot XI v.,” 31; Idem, “Nova kolektivna nakhodka s folisi ot XI v., namerena pri arheologicheskite razkopki v Silistra,” *Minalo* (2006), no. 1, 7–8.

466 Ūto Valeriev, “The Treasure of Golden Byzantine Coins from Professor Ishirkovo, Silistra Region,” *Pontica* 42 (2009), 653–61.

467 Madgearu, *Byzantine Military Organization on the Danube*, 138; Valeriev, “Kŭm istoriyata i arheologiyata na zemite na Dolniya Dunav,” 395–7.

468 Johannes Irmscher, “Istochniki po istorii Bolgarii,” in *Vostochnaya Yevropa v drevnosti i srednevekov’ye*, ed. Lev V. Cherepnin (Moscow: Nauka, 1978), 74–6.

469 From 1954 to 1960, three volumes of the *GIBI* series came out, encompassing the period from the 3rd to early 9th century. In 1961, the fourth volume was published, containing sources for the history of Bulgaria in the early 9th and first quarter of 10th centuries – the time of the first trilateral contacts between Byzantium, Bulgaria, and the Pechenegs. The year 1964 saw the publication of the fifth volume, devoted to the 10th century. Relations between Byzantium and various trans-Danubian Turks find the fullest reflection in the sources and commentaries published in volumes six to nine, which contain the works of *Theophanes Continuatus*, Leon Grammatikos, Nicholas Mystikos, Pseudo-Simeon, Ioannes Mauropous, Michael Psellos, Michael Attaleiates, Ioannes Skylitzes, Georgios Kedrenos, Kekaumenos, Anna Komnene, Theodoros Skoutariotes, Theophylact, and other authors: *GIBI*, vol. 6, eds. Mikhail Voĭnov et al. (Sofia: Izdaniye na Bŭlgarskata akademiya na naukite, 1965); vol. 7, eds. Genoveva Tsankova-Petkova and Petŭr Tivchev (Sofia: Izdaniye na Bŭlgarskata akademiya na naukite, 1968); vol. 8, eds. Mikhail Voĭnov et al. (Sofia: Izdaniye na Bŭlgarskata akademiya na naukite, 1972); vol. 9, *Proizvedeniya na Teofilakt Okhridski, arkhiepiiskop bŭlgarski, otnasyashti se do bŭlgarskata istoriya*, part 1, ed. Stoian

the 10th and 11th centuries was at that time (and to some extent still is) the most complete of all Cyrillic-language editions, including Yugoslavian,<sup>470</sup> as well as those published in neighboring Romania.<sup>471</sup> The translations made possible a fuller use of the sources by historians who did not speak the languages of the originals or did not have access to older editions that had become bibliographic rarities.<sup>472</sup> Concise descriptions of the texts and circumstances of their creation, as well as bibliographies of previous editions and critical studies, were another highlight of the series. However, when it came to matters of dispute, the authors of the commentaries mostly adhered to standard Bulgarian viewpoints, as expressed in the works of Vasil Zlatarski, Petăr Mutafchiev, or Ivan Duichev.

The Latin-language sources for Bulgarian history published in the *LIBI* sub-series<sup>473</sup> are also important for the study of the history of Turkic nomads in the Balkans in the 10th and 11th centuries.<sup>474</sup> These publications, carried out in accordance with the plans of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, and the

---

Maslev (Sofia: Izdaniye na Bŭlgarskata akademiya na naukite, 1974); vol. 9, *Proizvedeniya na Teofilakt Okhridski, arkhiepiskop bŭlgarski, otnasyashti se do bŭlgarskata istoriya*, part 2, ed. Iliya Iliev (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bŭlgarskata akademiya na naukite, 1994).

470 *Vizantijski izvori za istoriju naroda Jugoslavije*, vol. 3, eds. George Ostrogorsky and Franjo Barišić (Belgrade: Naučna knjiga, 1966). Review by Mikhail Voïnov, Vasilka Tŭpkova-Zaimova and Lyubomir Ionchev, in *IstPreg* (1968), no. 3, 113–8.

471 *Izvoreale Istoriei României*, vol. 2, *Autori. De la anul 300 pină la anul 1000*, eds. Haralambie Mihăescu et al. (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1970); *Izvoreale Istoriei României*, vol. 3, *Scritori bizantini (sec. XI–XIV)*, eds. Alexandru Elian and Nicolae-Șerban Tanașoca (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1975). Tudor Teoteoi, “[Review of:] *Fontes Historiae Daco-Romanae*, III,” *RRH* (1976), no. 4, 759–61.

472 For instance, *Orationes* by Ioannes Mauropous, were issued in Göttingen in 1882: *Johannis, Euchaitorum metropolitae, Quae in codice Vaticano Graeco 676 supersunt, Johannes Bollig ... descripsit, Paulus de Lagarde ... edidit* (Göttingen: Dietrich, 1882).

473 Regino of Prüm, Otto of Freising, *Vita Stephani regis Ungariae*, *Legenda S. Stephani regis, Gesta Hungarorum*, *Simonis de Keza Gesta Hungarorum*, *Chronicon Pictum*, Robert the Monk, Albert of Aachen, Johannes de Thurocz, and others.

474 *LIBI*, vol. 2, eds. Ivan Duichev et al. (Sofia: Izdaniye na Bŭlgarskata akademiya na naukite, 1959); vol. 3, eds. Ivan Duichev et al. (Sofia: Izdaniye na Bŭlgarskata akademiya na naukite, 1965); vol. 5, *Ungarski latinoezichni izvori*, part 1, *Narativni izvori*, eds. Iliya Iliev et al. (Sofia: Izdaniye na Bŭlgarskata akademiya na naukite, 2001). Selections of Greek- and Latin-language sources for the history of Bulgaria, including inscriptions on seals of Byzantine governors of the *themes* of Bulgaria and Paristrion, were also published in *Podbrani izvori za istoriyata na Vizantiya*, eds. Dimitŭr Angelov and Petŭr Tivchev (Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 1963, 1970, 1974, 1978); *Khristomatiya po istoriya na Bŭlgariya*, vol. 1, *Ranno srednovekovie. VII–XII v.*, eds. Petŭr Petrov and Vasil Gyuzelev (Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 1978).

appearance of new critical source studies became an impetus for new research on the basis of written sources, with some of it produced by the compilers of the series.

In 1979, Ivan Bozhilov (1940–2016) published an important monograph based on the so-called *Toparcha Gothicus*.<sup>475</sup> Despite the fact that the *Toparcha Gothicus* had been proven a forgery by Ihor Ševčenko in 1971,<sup>476</sup> Bozhilov used this opportunity to express his vision of the ethnic and political situation in the region, including his theory of the existence of a trans-Danubian Bulgaria.<sup>477</sup>

Two years later, Vasil Gyuzelev<sup>478</sup> published his *Medieval Bulgaria in Light of New Sources*.<sup>479</sup> It included an essay on the *Vitae of Cyril Phileotes*,<sup>480</sup> which,

---

475 Ivan Bozhilov, “Anonimūt na Khaze”. *Bŭlgariya i Vizantiya na Dolni Dunav v kraya na X v.* (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bŭlgarskata akademiya na naukite, 1979). Review: Diaconu, “Realitāti politice la Dunărea de Jos: Români, bizantini, bulgari, pecenegi.”

476 Ševčenko, “The Date and Author of so-called Fragments of Toparcha Gothicus”; Medvedev, “Excellent Scholar – Excellent Forger: The Case of Karl Benedict Hase.” Bozhilov’s book on the *Toparcha Gothicus* was written before Ihor Ševčenko exposed the forgery. Thus, Bozhilov faced a dilemma – should he forego publication, or should he write a refutation of Ševčenko’s claims? He chose the latter: Ivan Bozhilov, “Hase’s Anonym and Ihor Ševčenko’s Hypothesis,” *Byzantino-Bulgarica* 5 (1978), 245–58.

477 Even though Bulgarian historians today openly call the idea of trans-Danubian Bulgaria nationalistic, it has not entirely lost its appeal. See, for instance, Ian Mladzhev, “Trans-Danubian Bulgaria: Reality and Fiction,” *Byzantine Studies* 3 (1998), 85–128; Rasho Rashev, “Remarks on the archaeological evidence of forts and fortified settlements in 10th-century Bulgaria,” in *Borders, Barriers, and Ethnogenesis: Frontiers in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, ed. Florin Curta (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005), 51–58; Atanasov and Russev, “Onglos: Pervaya rezidentsiya bolgarskikh kanov na Nizhnem Dunaye.” Moreover, some Bulgarian historians assert that until the end of the 9th or even mid-10th century Bulgarian settlements existed in Crimea as well, where they were eventually destroyed by the Pechenegs: Dimitŭr Dimitrov, *Prabŭlgarite po Severnoto i Zapadnoto Chernomorie* (Varna: Georgi Bakalov, 1987), 177, 265 and 274; Khristo Dimitrov, *Bŭlgariya i nomadite do nachaloto na XI v.* (Plovdiv: Fondatsiya Bŭlgarsko istoricheskoto nasledstvo, 2011), 220–3.

478 About him: Miliyana Kaïmakamova, “Prof. Vasil Gyuzelev i prouchvaneto na Bŭlgarskoto srednovekovie,” *Starobŭlgaristika* 20 (1996), 72–7.

479 Vasil Gyuzelev, *Srednovekovna Bŭlgariya v svetlinata na novi izvori* (Sofia: Narodna prosveta, 1981); Khristo Khristov, “[Review of:] Vasil Gyuzelev, *Srednovekovna Bŭlgariya v svetlinata na novi izvori*. Sofiya, Narodna prosveta, 1981 g., 260s,” *IstPreg* (1982), no. 6, 132–6.

480 Vasil Gyuzelev, “Svedeniya za bŭlgarski gradove i oblasti v Zhitiето na Kiril Fileot (XI v.),” in his *Srednovekovna Bŭlgariya v svetlinata na novi izvori*, 61–7.

though mentioned by Moravcsik as a source for the history of the Pechenegs and Cumans,<sup>481</sup> was still languishing in scholarly obscurity at the time.<sup>482</sup>

Stoyan Maslev studied the letters of Theophylact of Ohrid, whose dates and addressees remain unclear to this day. Maslev offered some suggestions as to their dating; he used, among other things, references to outside dangers that may have had to do with the Pechenegs and Cumans.<sup>483</sup> Alexandr Tonchev combed through Anna Komnene's *Alexiad* for information on the history of Bulgaria.<sup>484</sup> He also highlighted the separate problem of the identification of geographical names used by the Byzantine princess. Tonchev mentioned the Pechenegs in the section of his article that surveyed the ethnic map of Bulgaria in the era of Anna Komnene;<sup>485</sup> but overall, he relegated nomads, as well as the Vlachs and others ethnic groups, to secondary roles both in that section and in the history of the region in general.<sup>486</sup> Petūr Tivchev authored a study on the role and place of Bulgarians in the Byzantine army in the 11th and 12th centuries.<sup>487</sup> He noted that the Bulgarian population of Byzantium suffered from nomadic attacks, but at the same time these attacks weakened Constantinople's hold over the region, and often nomads became allies of the Bulgarians.<sup>488</sup> Miliyana Kaïmakamova analysed historical sources of Bulgarian origin pertaining to the history of Pecheneg raids on the Byzantine lands in

481 Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, 1, 557.

482 Probably because prior to the 1964 edition by Nicolas Katasképénos and Étienne Sargologos it was known only in fragments: *La vie de saint Cyrille le Philéote, moine byzantin*, ed. Étienne Sargologos (Subsidia Hagiographica, 39) (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1964).

483 Stoyan Maslev, "Les lettres de Théophylacte de Bulgarie à Nicéphore Mélissénos," *RÉB* 30 (1972), no. 1, 183.

484 Alexandr Tonchev, "Svedeniya za bŭlgarskata istoriya v 'Aleksiada' na Anna Komnina," *IstPreg* (1970), no. 5, 124–8.

485 *Ibid.*, 134–8.

486 A similar approach can be found in Tonchev, "Italianskite normani i balkanskoto naselenie pod vizantiiska vlast (1081–1110 g.)," *IstPreg* (1975), no. 2, 25–45. Even though he used the latest editions of the *Alexiad* (at that point it was Bernard Leib's 1936–37 Paris edition and Yakov N. Lyubarskiï's Moscow edition of 1965), he mostly followed the Bulgarian tradition in the interpretation and dating of events involving nomads – for instance, he dated the Cuman "Pseudo-Diogenes" campaign to 1091 (Tonchev, "Svedeniya za bŭlgarskata istoriya v 'Aleksiada' na Anna Komnina," 132). Tonchev was also then unaware of Diaconu's book *The Pechenegs on the Lower Danube*, where the questions raised in his article were dealt with in more depth.

487 Petūr Tivchev, "Za uchastieto na bŭlgari vŭv vizantiiskata voiska prez perioda na vizantiiskoto igo (1018–1185 gg.)," *IstPreg* (1963), no. 1, 83.

488 *Ibid.*, 87–8; Petūr Tivchev, "[Review of:] G.G. Litavrin, *Bolgariya i Vizantiya v XI–XII vv.* Moskva, 1960 g.," *IstPreg* (1962), no. 5, 91.

the 11th century.<sup>489</sup> Bulgarian Arabists Stoyanka Kenderova and Boris Nedkov considered the legacy of the cartographer al-Idrīsī.<sup>490</sup>

Significant contributions to Bulgarian historiography of the nomads of the North Pontic steppe were made by Vasilka Tŭpkova-Zaimova (1924–2018).<sup>491</sup> A philologist by training, she was involved in the publication of the volumes two to eight and ten to eleven of the *GIBI*, which covered Greek sources from the time of Justinian I to the 13th century. Her first works were devoted to military roads and fortifications,<sup>492</sup> but eventually she became interested in Byzantine-barbarian relations.<sup>493</sup> In 1966, Tŭpkova-Zaimova published a book on *Invasions and Ethnic Change in the Balkans in the 6th to 7th Centuries*.<sup>494</sup> Beginning in the 1970s, she focused mainly on problems of the history of Byzantium and Bulgaria in the 10th to 13th centuries, and two topics in particular: the administrative structure of these states<sup>495</sup> and their relations with

- 
- 489 Miliyana Kaïmakamova, “Dve starobŭlgarski letopisni sŭchineniya ot XI v.,” *IstPreg* (1976), no. 5, 89–92. Eadem, *Bŭlgarska srednovekovna istoriopsis* (Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 1990). See also: Tŭpkova-Zaimova and Miltenova, *Istoriko-apokaliptichna knižhnina v srednovekovna Vizantiya i Bŭlgariya*; Biliarsky, *The Tale of the Prophet Isaiah. The Destiny and Meanings of an Apocryphal Text*. Kaïmakamova also agreed with Gyuzelev’s thesis that the Dobruja inscription of 943 should be linked to a Pecheneg raid: Miliyana Kaïmakamova, “Starobŭlgarskoto istoriko-letopisno tvorchestvo ot sredata na IX do nachaloto na XI v.,” *GSIU* 72 (1978), 43.
- 490 Boris Nedkov, *Bŭlgariya i sŭsednite ŭ zemi prez XII vek spored Idrisi* (Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 1960); Stoianka Kenderova and Boyan Beshevliev, *Balkanskiyat poluoostrov, izobrazen v kartite na Al-Idrisi. Chast 1. Paleografsko i istoriko-geografsko izsledvane* (Sofia: Narodna biblioteka “Kiril i Metodii,” 1990).
- 491 Founder and member of the Institute of Balkan Studies at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences.
- 492 Vasilka Tŭpkova-Zaimova, “Kreposti i ukrepeni gradove prez Pŭrvoto bŭlgarsko tsarstvo,” in *Voennoistoricheski sbornik* (1956), no. 3, 40–60; Eadem, “Kŭm vŭprosa za voennite pŭtishita prez Pŭrvoto Bŭlgarsko tsarstvo,” *IstPreg* (1958), no. 1, 58–73; Eadem, “Les voies romaines dans les rŕgions bulgares à l’ŕpoque mŕdiŕvale,” in *VI Mezhdunarodna konferentsiya po klasicheski studii, Plovdiv, 1962* (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bŭlgarskata akademiya na naukite, 1963), 165–72.
- 493 Eadem, “Sur les rapports entre la population indigŕne des rŕgions balkaniques et les ‘Barbares’ au VIe–VIIe siŕcle,” *Byzantino-Bulgarica* 1 (1962), 67–78.
- 494 Eadem, *Nashestviya i etnicheski promeni na Balkanite prez VI–VII v.* (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bŭlgarskata akademiya na naukite, 1966).
- 495 Eadem, “Rolyata i administrativna organizatsiya na t. nar. ‘Otvŭddunavska Bŭlgariya’”; Eadem, “L’administration byzantine au Bas-Danube (fin du Xe–XIe s.);” Eadem, “Quelques particularitŕs dans l’organisation militaire des rŕgions de Bas-Danube et la politique byzantine aux XIe–XIIe siŕcles,” in *Ŕtudes de civilisation mŕdiŕvale, IXe–XIIe siŕcles: Mŕlanges offerts à Edmond-Renŕ Labande* (Poitiers: Centre d’ŕtudes supŕrieures de civilisation mŕdiŕvale, 1974), 667–74; Eadem, “Quelques observations sur la domination byzantine aux bouches du Danube – Le sort de Lykostomion et de quelques autres villes cŕtiŕres,”

the region's population, including the Turkic nomads inhabiting the steppes north of the Black Sea.<sup>496</sup> Tüpkova-Zaimova's familiarity with the events of the 4th to 7th centuries in the Roman Empire led her to propose a theory of the so-called "second barbarization" of Byzantium's Danubian *limes*.<sup>497</sup>

- 
- Studia Balcanica* 1 (1970), 79–86; Ivan Ľordanov and Vasilka Tüpkova-Zaimova, "Quelques nouvelles données sur l'administration byzantine au Bas Danube (fin du Xe–XIe s.)," in *Géographie historique du monde méditerranéen*, ed. Hélène Ahrweiler. (Paris: Éditions de la Sorbonne, 1988), 119–26; Vasilka Tüpkova-Zaimova, "Byzance et les structures étatiques dans les Balkans aux IXe–Xe ss.," *BF* 18 (1992), 93–9; Eadem, "L'administration byzantine au Bas Danube." Tüpkova-Zaimova's works on administrative structures in Bulgaria and Byzantium represent a good example of the "line of defense" that Bulgarian historiography continued to hold against the "encroachments" of mostly Romanian medievalists ever since the dispute between Vasil Zlatarski and Nicolae Bănescu. For instance, in the article "Some Notes on the Byzantine Domination in the Danube Delta," the scholar attempted to chip away at the arguments of Helene Ahrweiler and Petre Năsturel, who believed that in the 9th century the Danube Delta belonged to Byzantium, not Bulgaria (Eadem, "Quelques observations sur la domination byzantine aux bouches du Danube – Le sort de Lykostomion et de quelques autres villes côtières."). The study "The Role and Administrative Organization of the So-Called Trans-Danubian Bulgaria" was also directed against some Romanian historians, who emphasized the uncertainty of power in Dobruja and on the left bank of the Lower Danube in line with their conclusions about the existence of Romanian proto-state entities in these regions (Eadem, "Rolyata i administrativna organizatsiya na t. nar. 'Otvüddunavska Bülgariya'"). Eventually, Tüpkova-Zaimova did, however, acknowledge that Bănescu was right: Eadem, "L'administration byzantine au Bas-Danube," 95 and 104.
- 496 Eadem, "Vizantiya i naselenieto v kraïdunavskite zemi prez XI vek," *Vekove* 2 (1973), no. 3, 24–32; Eadem, "Tyurkiskiye kochevniki, vizantiyskaya administratsiya i mestnoye nasele-niye na Nizhnem Dunaye (XI–XII vv.)," in *Vostochnaya Yevropa v drevnosti i srednevekov'ye* (1978), 67–73; Eadem, "Les mouvements des populations en Mésie et en Thrace entre le début du XIe et le début du XIIIe siècle," *BF* 7 (1979), 193–202; Eadem, "La population du Bas-Danube et le pouvoir Byzantin (XIe–XIIe s.)," in *Actes du XVe Congrès International des Études Byzantines. Athènes. Septembre 1976*, 4, 331–9; Eadem, "Les μιξοβάρβαροι et la situation politique ethnique au Bas-Danube pendant la seconde moitié du XIe s.," in *Actes du XIVe Congrès*, 2, 615–9; Eadem, "Quelques remarques sur les noms ethniques chez les auteurs byzantins," in *Studien zur Geschichte und Philosophie des Altertums*, ed. János Harmatta (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1968), 400–5; Eadem, "Der bulgarische Staat im Beziehungsgefüge der Völker auf dem Balkan vom 7. bis zum 10. Jahrhundert," *Jahrbuch für Geschichte des Feudalismus* 5 (1981), 49–56; Eadem, "Dolni Dunav – limes i limen mezhdü Vizantiya i slavyanskiya svyat," in *Rusko-bülgarski vrüzki*, 39–45; Eadem, "Migrations frontalières en Bulgarie médiévale," in *Migrations et diasporas méditerranéennes: (Xe–XVIe siècles)*. *Actes du colloque de Conques (octobre 1999)*, eds. Michel Balard and Alain Ducellier (Paris: Éditions de la Sorbonne, 2002), 125–131.
- 497 Vasilka Tüpkova-Zaimova, "Vtorata 'varvarizatsiya' na Dunavskite gradove (XI–XII v.)," in *Srednevekovniyat bülgarski grad*, ed. Petür Petrov (Sofia: Bülgarsko istoricheskó družestvo, 1980), 47–55. In this article, Tüpkova-Zaimova directly compares the Byzantine 10th century in the Balkans with late antiquity: *Ibid.*, 48–9.



Zlatarski's assertion that the Bulgarian lands maintained autonomy long after their incorporation into Byzantium (up to 1059) formed the basis for the post-war scholarship of Angelov, Duichev, and other Bulgarian Byzantinologists. But by the mid-1970s it had been refuted, mainly as a result of the appearance of new sigillographic materials (both the large seal archive from Preslav and discoveries of Romanian archaeologists) and Nikos Oikonomidès' publication of the *Taktikon Escorial*.<sup>498</sup> Bulgarian historiography needed a new conception of the history of the Lower Danube in the 10th and 11th centuries. Just such a conception was set forth in Tüpkova-Zaimova's paper "The Population of the Lower Danube and Byzantine Rule in the 11th-12th Centuries," delivered at the 15th International Congress of Byzantine Studies (Athens, 1976).<sup>499</sup>

Tüpkova-Zaimova noted the continuity of urban life in the towns of the Lower Danube in the 10th and 11th centuries and argued that the region's population was predominantly Bulgarian. Among other ethnic groups present there, she named trans-Danubian Turks, Vlachs, and Anglo-Saxons.<sup>500</sup> Regarding Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans, the author, drawing on excavations on a number of settlements in what is today northeastern Bulgaria, concluded that these nomads did not stay in one place for long and eventually were assimilated by the Bulgarians.<sup>501</sup> Tüpkova-Zaimova wrote that, given the borderland nature of the territory between the Black Sea, the Balkans, and the Danube, Constantinople was not able to establish here the same kind of order as south of the Balkans. Therefore, these lands "were not in practice truly part of the territory of [Byzantium]." The power vacuum was filled by the spontaneous organization of the local (read Bulgarian) element, which was

498 Ivan Bozhilov, "L'administration byzantine en Bulgarie (1018-1186). Le cas de Paristrion-Paradounavon (Paradounavis)," in *Vyzántio kai Voulgaroi (1018-1185)*, eds. Katerina Nikolaou and Kostas G. Tsiknakis (Athens: Institutoúto Vyzantinón Erevnón, 2008), 92; Tüpkova-Zaimova, *Dolni Dunav – granichna zona*, 10 and 58.

499 Eadem, "La population du Bas-Danube et le pouvoir Byzantin (XIe–XIIe s.);" Vasil Gyuzelev, "Petnadeseti mezhdunaroden vizantolozhki kongres i uchastiето na búlgarskite istoritsi," *IstPreg* (1976), no. 6, 137.

500 The presence of Anglo-Saxons in the history of the region in the 11th century is a fact, but their numbers could not be large, so by placing them next to the Vlachs Tüpkova-Zaimova to a certain extent downplayed the role of the Vlach population. Curiously, in the slightly modified Russian version of this paper (1978), the Rus' ("Russians") top the list of the Lower-Danube ethnic groups, even though they do not appear in the original text: Eadem, "Tyurkskiye kochevniki, vizantiyskaya administratsiya i mestnoye naseleniye na Nizhnem Dunaye (XI–XII vv.)," 72.

501 Eadem, "La population du Bas-Danube et le pouvoir Byzantin (XIe–XIIe s.)," 331–7. The theory of the complete assimilation of the Pechenegs by the Bulgarians is supported by Stanev: Kamen Stanev, "Migratsiya ot Trakiya kúm Severna Búlgariya v kraya na XII–nachaloto na XIII vek i neinite posleditsi," 212.

manifested, among other things, in the emergence of local military forces.<sup>502</sup> Constantinople's attempts to recruit the nomads as federates created a "third force" in the region, which, while at first hostile to the structures formed by the local population, eventually became the latter's ally in the fight against Byzantium.<sup>503</sup> At the same time, due to recurrent nomadic attacks, the ethnic and political situation that took shape on the Lower Danube in the 11th and 12th centuries resembled the 6th–7th centuries, when groups of motley barbarians wandered between the Danube and Haemus.<sup>504</sup>

Thus, Tüpkova-Zaimova bridged the gap between the First and Second Bulgarian Empires by positing the existence on the Lower Danube of semi-state entities created by the local Bulgarian population. This view of the region's history did, however, resemble similar conceptions proposed by Romanian historians, who pronounced said entities Romanian. Even so, in her paper she gave somewhat more "rights" to nomads. While for Zlatarski<sup>505</sup> and Angelov<sup>506</sup> the late nomads were a kind of natural disaster against which the Bulgarians defended the Balkans, Tüpkova-Zaimova raised the questions of their relationship (not exclusively hostile) with the local population, their way of life, customs, and traces they left in material culture, portraying them as allies of the local inhabitants in the struggle against the imperial power and as part of a multi-ethnic "mixed-barbarian" conglomerate of peoples.<sup>507</sup>

Her book *The Lower Danube as a Border Zone of the Byzantine West*<sup>508</sup> addressed the entire set of issues of the region's history discussed by the broad

502 Tüpkova-Zaimova, "La population du Bas-Danube et le pouvoir Byzantin (XIe–XIIe s.)," 335–6.

503 Ibid., 336.

504 Eadem, "Tyrurkskiye kochevniki, vizantiyskaya administratsiya i mestnoye naseleniye na Nizhnem Dunaye (XI–XII vv.)," 70.

505 Zlatarski, *Bŭlgariya podŭ vizantiŭsko vladichestvo (1018–1187)*, 37–8.

506 Dimitŭr Angelov, "Sŭzdavane na bŭlgarskata dŭrzhava i neŭnata istoricheska rolya," in *Bŭlgariya 681–1981*, ed. Khristo Khristov (Sofia: Otechestven front, 1981), 63.

507 Interestingly, a similar approach was adopted as early as 1973 by Tanaşoca, a Romanian scholar who, like Tüpkova-Zaimova, was involved in the editing and translation of Greek sources. Perhaps his study pushed Tüpkova-Zaimova (who quoted it in her Athens paper) to rethink the history of the region: Tanaşoca, "Les Mixobarbares et les formations politiques paristriennes du XIe siècle," 76–7; Tüpkova-Zaimova, "La population du Bas-Danube et le pouvoir Byzantin (XIe–XIIe s.)," 338. See also: Jacek Bonarek, "Le Bas Danube dans la seconde moitié du XIème siècle: nouveaux États ou nouveaux peuples?" in *Byzantina et Slavica Cracoviensia*, vol. 5, *Byzantium, New Peoples, New Powers: The Byzantino-Slav Contact Zone, from the Ninth to the 15th Century*, eds. Miliana Kaimakakamova et al. (Cracow: Jagiellonian University, 2007), 193–200.

508 The book was generally met with approval by reviewers in Bulgaria and abroad. Petre Diaconu, however, criticized the author's limited use of archaeological data.

community of Balkan historians, as well as Byzantinologists from other countries, throughout the 19th and 20th centuries. Among them were such problems as the presence of the First Bulgarian Empire north of the Danube, the time of the Byzantine conquest of individual Bulgarian territories and their post-conquest administration, the controversy surrounding the *Toparcha Gothicus*, the relationship between the local population of Byzantium’s Lower Danubian provinces and the central government, the restoration of imperial control over the region in the late 11th century, and others.<sup>509</sup> Overall, the book was a summation of Tüpkova-Zaimova’s previous work.

The Pechenegs were also portrayed as an independent political force in Tüpkova-Zaimova’s studies of the Byzantine administration of the Lower Danubian lands, published between 1973 and 1993. It was the Pecheneg menace that forced Constantinople to keep trying to establish its dominance on the left bank of the Danube, fortify Dobruja, organize the new provinces on a military rather than civilian model, and, finally, recruit the Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans as federates.<sup>510</sup> According to Tüpkova-Zaimova, an important role in the organization of Bulgarian and Byzantine provinces was played by the threat of Pecheneg invasion and by the general system of relations between first Bulgaria and then Byzantium on the one hand and the nomads of the North Pontic steppes on the other. In her piece on “trans-Danubian Bulgaria,” she pointed out that, for the Bulgarian state in the 9th and 10th centuries, the territory beyond the Danube served as a buffer separating it from the Magyars and Pechenegs. The disappearance of this buffer in the northeast during the reign of Tsar Simeon and in the west in the time of his son Peter made it possible, in particular, for Byzantium to put diplomatic pressure on Bulgaria, which came under nomadic threat. At the same time, the restoration of Byzantine rule along the Danube turned into such a buffer zone the territory between the Balkans and the Danube, which led to frequent Pecheneg, Uz, and Cuman invasions of the imperial territory.<sup>511</sup>

*The Lower Danube as a Border Zone of the Byzantine West* and a number of Tüpkova-Zaimova’s later works reflected the trends then prevalent in global Byzantine studies. In 1971, at the 14th International Congress of Byzantine

---

Reviews: Strashimir Lishev, in *BHR* (1977), no. 3, 101–3; Genoveva Tsankova-Petkova, *Byzantino-Bulgarica* 5 (1978), 345–7; Petre Diaconu, “Istoria Dobrogei în unele lucrări străine recente (II),” *RdI* (1977), no. 10, 1893–1900; Mikhail V. Bibikov, “Iz istorii Nizhnego Podunav’ya v X–XII vv.,” 104–5.

509 Tüpkova-Zaimova, *Dolni Dunav – granichna zona*, 17–33, 34–70, 44–51, 71–96 and 97–103.

510 Eadem, “L’administration byzantine au Bas-Danube,” 97–102, 104–5.

511 Eadem, “Rolyata i administrativna organizatsiya na t. nar. ‘Otvüddunavska Bülgariya,’” 70–2.

Studies in Bucharest, the borderlands of Byzantium received considerable attention as a problem in their own right. The papers “La frontière et les frontières de Byzance en Orient” by Héléne Glykatzi-Ahrweiler<sup>512</sup> and “Byzantine Frontier Zones and Cultural Exchanges” by Dimitri Obolensky,<sup>513</sup> presented at the congress, inspired further research because they provided important material for considering the Byzantine borders as a phenomenon. Subsequent studies in the history of the Lower Danube were influenced by these authors’ drawing attention to such factors as climate, the multicultural makeup of the Mediterranean region (including the Black Sea), Byzantine influence on borderland peoples and vice versa, close connection between the economic and cultural levers of Byzantine influence, coexistence between nomadic and sedentary populations, and the settling of nomads in various regions of the empire.<sup>514</sup>

The new terms introduced into the study of borderlands by Obolensky – *limes* and *limen* – were further developed by Tüpkova-Zaimova. Obolensky had coined the term *limes* to denote a clear boundary, often marked by a geographic barrier, while *limen* referred to a buffer zone, most favorable to cultural and any other exchange.<sup>515</sup> In the article “The Lower Danube – a *Limes* and *Limen* between Byzantium and the Slavic World,” Tüpkova-Zaimova differentiated more clearly between a *limes* as a “hard” border, including that defined by a natural barrier, and *limen* as simply a natural limit separated from the corresponding *limes* by a buffer zone.<sup>516</sup> She attempted to determine when the barrier of the Danube was a *limes* and when it was a *limen* between Byzantium and its neighbors.<sup>517</sup> Nomads (except for the Proto-Bulgarians, as co-creators

512 Héléne Ahrweiler, “La frontière et les frontières de Byzance en Orient,” in *Actes du XIVe Congrès*, 1, 209–30.

513 Dimitri Obolensky, “Byzantine Frontier Zones and Cultural Exchanges,” in *Actes du XIVe Congrès*, 1, 304–13.

514 *Ibid.*, 305–11.

515 *Ibid.*, 304.

516 Tüpkova-Zaimova, “Dolni Dunav – limes i limen mezhdru Vizantiya i slavyanskiya svyat,” 39.

517 According to Tüpkova-Zaimova, in the case of the Danube, despite the existence of a *limes*, there always was trade, which in the early Middle Ages played an important part in Byzantium’s relations with the Goths, Huns, and other nomads. Century after century, Tüpkova-Zaimova tracked the changing status of the Danube vis-à-vis the empire. According to her observations, in the 6th century the Danube served more as a *limes* than *limen*, but at the same time the empire’s relationship with the Slavs as its federates more or less crystallized. In the 7th century, the Danube ceased to be Byzantium’s border, the area between the Haemus and the Danube delta became a buffer zone, and “the powerful movement of the Eastern and Southern Slavs led to a complex cultural exchange between the ‘Byzantine front’ and the ‘Pontic front’ – that is, generally, between the Mediterranean

of the Bulgarian people) played in Tŭpkova-Zaimova’s conception of *limes-limen* conversion solely the role of a belligerent, destructive force. From her article it followed that mutual influence was possible only between settled peoples.<sup>518</sup> In a paper delivered by her jointly with Plamen Pavlov at the 1992 conference “Bulgarians North of the Black Sea” in Veliko Tarnovo, the authors compared the importance of the Danube and the Black Sea for Byzantium and its neighbors.<sup>519</sup>

---

civilization and the civilization of the steppes, all the way to the Caucasus”: Eadem, “Dolni Dunav – limes i limen mezhdv Vizantiya i slavyanskiya svyat,” 40.

518 Ibid., 43.

519 The co-presenters argued that, despite some familiarity of both the settled and nomadic peoples of the region with the Black Sea, the Byzantine principle of thalassocracy – imperial supremacy at sea – for a long time secured for Byzantium at least influence, if not dominance, throughout the Black Sea region. Moreover, “the sea remained alien to the northern barbarians”; it did not truly become part of their life. If the Danube was sometimes a *limes* and sometimes a *limen* for different cultures and civilizations during the Middle Ages, the Black Sea always remained the boundary between the “Pontic” and “Byzantine” fronts: Vasilka Tŭpkova-Zaimova and Plamen Pavlov, “Severnite ‘varvari’ i Chernomoriето. Usednalite i nomadskite narodi v Yugoiztochna Evropa i vŭztkata im s Chernomore,” in *Bŭlgarite v Severnoto Prichernomorie. Izsledovaniya i materialy*, vol. 2, ed. Petŭr Todorov (Veliko Tarnovo: Izdatelska kŭshata Asta, 1993), 21–9. Thanks in part to the work of Tŭpkova-Zaimova (among others), from the late 1970s historians of the countries of Southeastern Europe increasingly turned to so-called “civilizational subjects.” In 1977, an international symposium on Slavic archaeology “Slavs and Nomads in the 6th to 12th Centuries” was held at the Rila Monastery: Dimitŭr Angelov, “Die Bulgarischen Slawen und die Nomaden (VI–XII Jh.).” The section “History – the Middle Ages” at the 4th International Congress on the Study of Southeastern Europe (Turkey, 1979) included the topic “The Population of Southeastern Europe and Migrating Peoples Face to Face with the Byzantine Civilization (6th to 12th Centuries);” see “Thématique du IV Congrès International des Études Sud-Est Européenes (Turquie, 22-27 août 1979),” *RRH* (1978), no. 3, 557. The same year, the city of Nesebar began hosting the periodic international symposium “Bulgarica Pontica Medii Aevi,” dedicated to civilizational contacts and interactions in the Black Sea region: Alisa V. Bank, Sergeĭ P. Karpov, “Pervyy mezhdunarodnyy simpozium ‘Bulgarica Pontica Medii Aevi’ (Nesebr, 23-27 maya 1979),” *VizVrem* 42 (1981), 246–8; Peter Schreiner, “Die Bulgaria Pontica Medii Aevi: Eine Institution,” *SOF* 47 (1988), 261–3. The traditional “Pontic Readings” in Varna also deal with such subjects. See, for instance, *Cherno more mezhdv iztoka i zapada. Reka Dunav: most mezhdv narodi i kulturi. IX Pontiiskie chteniya, Varna, 16-17 mai 2003*. See also: Petre Năsturel, “Le premier Congrès International d’ÉB et du Sud-Est Européen. Histoire (Ve–XVIIIe s.),” *RÉSEE* 3 (1967), 577; Stelian Brezeanu, “Colocviul de geografie istorică bizantină,” *Rdl* (1978), no. 2, 334–5; “Międzynarodowy symposium ‘Słowianie i nomadzi w VI–XI w.’ – 7.–10. X. 1977,” *Slavia Antiqua* 25 (1978), 380; Constantin Șerban, “Sesiunea Științifică ‘Pontica ‘81,’” *Rdl* (1982), no. 2, 345–8; Armand Goșu, “Al doilea Congres Internațional de studii românești, Iași, 6-10 iulie 1993,” *RI* (1994), no. 1–2, 169–73; Nagy Pienaru, “Simpozionul ‘Marea Neagră’ – zonă de confluență a civilizațiilor,” *RI* (1996), no. 7–8, 639–40; Ion Stanciu, “Seminar

One of the editors of the *GIBI* series Ivan Bozhilov devoted a number of studies to medieval Bulgaria's relations with the Pechenegs. In 1971, he published a response to Diaconu's book on the Pechenegs,<sup>520</sup> putting forth several new hypotheses that would be developed in Bozhilov's later work "Bulgaria and the Pechenegs."<sup>521</sup> The latter article covered the period from the end of the 9th century to the time when the First Bulgarian Empire completely lost its sovereignty (even though, according to the author, the problem merited a book-length study).<sup>522</sup> Bozhilov addressed several issues, including the date of Ioannes Bogas' mission to the Pechenegs. In his view, it took place between April and mid-August 917, and not in 914, as previously thought. He also argued for the possibility of the Pechenegs' involvement in the Battle of Acheloos on 20 August 917 as Bulgaria's allies.<sup>523</sup> On the question of the territory occupied

---

International: 'Marea Neagră – poartă a Europei', Mangalia, 6–12 octombrie 1996," *RI* (1997), no. 1–2, 131–2.

520 Ivan Bozhilov, "Les Petchénégues dans l'histoire des terres du Bas-Danube," *ÉB* 3 (1971), 172–3.

521 Bozhilov, "Bŭlgariya i pechenezite (896–1018)."

522 *Ibid.*, 37–8.

523 In a 1983 monograph, Bozhilov clarified his views on the Pecheneg involvement in the events of the Bulgaro-Byzantine war, allowing for the participation of the Pechenegs that lived east of the Dnieper in the Byzantine coalition, and those from the Dnieper's right bank – on the side of Bulgaria: *Idem*, *Tsar Simeon Veliki (893–927)*, 123–4. Despite the fact that it was very much hypothetical and directly contradicted by the source testimony, Bozhilov's assertion that the Pechenegs fought as the Bulgarians' allies in the Battle of Acheloos was supported and further developed by Khristo Dimitrov: Khristo Dimitrov, "Bulgaria and the Magyars at the Beginning of the 10th Century," *ÉB* 22 (1986), 75–6; *Idem*, *Bŭlgarsko-ungarski otnosheniya prez srednovekovieto. Istoricheski izsledvaniya* (Sofia: Akademichno izdatelstvo "Prof. Marin Drinov," 1998), 60–4; *Idem*, *Bŭlgariya i nomadite do nachaloto na XI v., 197–205*. Dimitrov adhered to the version that Valandar, mentioned in al-Mas'udi, was the fortress of Develtos (Debelt, near Burgas). In addition to al-Mas'udi, another source of speculation about the participation of the Pechenegs and Magyars as Simeon's allies in the events of 917 was the *Miracula S. Georgii*, in which the opponents of Constantinople are called "Βουλγάρων και Ούγγρων και Σκυθῶν και Μηδων και Τούρκων" (Bulgarians, Hungarians, Scythians, Medes, and Turks), and which lists among the Byzantine generals Leo Phokas: *Miracula S. Georgii*, ed. Joannes B. Aufhauser (Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1913), 20–1. Ivan Duichev rejected the possibility that the Pechenegs fought in this battle on Simeon's side, but he viewed the Magyars as the tsar's allies (identifying Leo Phokas with the Byzantine general of the time of Empress Zoe, rather than the brother of Emperor Nikephoros II Phokas – that is, with the participant in the war of 917, not 967–971): Ivan Duichev, "Razkaz na 'chudoto' na velikomuchenik Georgi sus sina na Lŭv Paflagonski, plennik u bŭlgarite," in his *Bŭlgarsko srednovekovie. Prouchvaniya vŭrkhu politicheskata i kulturnata istoriya na srednovekovna Bŭlgariya* (Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 1972), 513–28. In 2017, to commemorate the 1100th anniversary of the Battle of Acheloos, a special collection of articles was published: *Simeonova Bŭlgariya*. In his contribution, Tomo Tomov generally doubts that the Pechenegs fought in this war on Simeon's side: Tomo Tomov, "Nyakolko

by the Pechenegs in the second quarter to the middle of the 10th century in the context of their relations with the Bulgarians after Tsar Simeon's death, he sided with Petre Diaconu. He also reconsidered the attack on Dobruja in 943,<sup>524</sup> the role of nomads in Sviatoslav's Bulgarian wars, and the unsuccessful attempt of the Bulgarian voivode Krakra to involve them in anti-Byzantine activities. Bozhilov's reviews of works on the history of the Balkan region are also worth mentioning.<sup>525</sup> In 2008, he published his views on the structure of the Byzantine administration in Paristrion in 1018–1186.<sup>526</sup> His works on historical geography are important as well.<sup>527</sup>

- 
- shtrikhi kŭm Akheloškata bitka,” in *Simeonova Bŭlgariya*, 67–8. Zhenya Zhekova writes that the Pechenegs may have received from Constantinople approximately 475 kg of gold for their participation in the battle: Zhenya Zhekova, “Parichni plashtaniya na Vizantiya, svŭrzani s bitkata pri Akheloŭi,” in *Simeonova Bŭlgariya*, 107–8. Sashka Georgieva looks at Tsar Simeon's marital diplomacy, including his policies towards the Pechenegs: Sashka Georgieva, “Brachnata diplomatsiya na bŭlgarskiya vladetel Simeon Veliki,” in *Simeonova Bŭlgariya*, 231–4.
- 524 Bozhilov criticized Gyuzelev's position regarding the cause of the Pecheneg raid on Dobruja in 943. Gyuzelev explained it by treachery on the part of Constantinople: Gyuzelev, “Dobrudzhanskiyat nadpis i sŭbitiyata v Bŭlgariya prez 943 g.,” 45. Bozhilov thought the Pechenegs were put up to it by Prince Igor': Bozhilov, “Bŭlgariya i pechenezite (896–1018),” 60. The scholar considered the “Dobruja inscription” and the events of 943 in more depth in the article “L'inscription du jupan Dimitre de l'an 943 (théories et faits),” *Études historiques* 6 (1973), 11–28.
- 525 Idem, “Kulturata Dridu i Pŭrvoto Bŭlgarsko tsarstvo”; Bozhilov and Gyuzelev, “[Review of]: Barnea I., *Ştefănescu Şt. Din istoria Dobrogei*”; Ivan Bozhilov, “Izdaniya na vizantiŭski pechati,” *IstPreg* (1990), no. 10, 69–71; Idem, “[Review of:] J.V.A. Fine, Jr., *The Early Mediaeval Balkans. A Critical Survey from the Sixth to the Twelfth Century*, XIX + 336 p.,” *IstPreg* (1990), no. 11–12, 85.
- 526 Ivan Bozhilov, “L'administration byzantine en Bulgarie (1018-1186). Le cas de Paristrion-Paradounavon (Paradounavis).”
- 527 Idem, “Kŭm istoricheskata geografiya na Severozapadnoto Chernomorie,” *INMV* 11 (1975), 27–37; 12 (1976), 19–32. Sources for the history of the Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans in the Balkan-Danubian region were considered by a number of Bulgarian scholars working on the history of the Crusades and historical geography – Petŭr Koledarov, Krasimira Gagova, Aleksandŭr Kuzev, Dimcho Momchilov, Dimitŭr Stoimenov, Elena Koicheva, Annie Dancheva-Vasileva, and others: Petŭr Koledarov, “Istoricheskata geografiya na Severozapadnoto Chernomorie po dannite na Konstantin Bagrenorodni,” *IstPreg* (1977), no. 3, 50–64; Idem, “Otbranitelnata i granichnata sistema na Bŭlgariya ot 681–1018,” *Voennoistoricheski sbornik* (1978), no. 3, 109–23; Idem, “Bŭlgarite, tekhnite zemi i dŭrzhava v naŭ-starite karti,” in *Istoriya, izkustvo i kultura na srednovkovna Bŭlgariya*, ed. Vasil Gyuzelev (Sofia : Narodna prosveta, 1981), 84–103; Krasimira Gagova, “Problemi na istoricheskata geografiya na Severna Trakiya prez srednovkovieto,” in *Vtori mezhdunaroden kongres*, 595–604; Eadem, *Trakiya prez bŭlgarskoto srednovkovie (istoricheska geografiya)* (Sofia: Universitetsko izdatelstvo “Sv. Kliment Okhridski,” 1995); Aleksandŭr Kuzev, “Za imenata na srednovkovnata krepost na dunavskiya ostrov Pŭkuyul Luŭ Soare,”

In 1988, Khristo Dimitrov and Iliya Iliev co-authored the article “The 15th-Century *Chronica Hungarorum* by Johannes de Thurocz as a Source for the Medieval History of Bulgaria,”<sup>528</sup> responding to a new edition of this source that had come out in Hungary.<sup>529</sup> The authors drew attention to the chronicle’s valuable testimony on the history of Pecheneg- and Cuman-Byzantine relations, particularly its detailed account of the events of the Hungaro-Byzantine war of 1072–73, where a Pecheneg force fought on the empire’s side, and the campaign of the Hungarian ruler Salomon and the Cuman (Pecheneg?) khan Kutesk against Byzantium.

A book by Khristo Dimitrov (of the Institute for Historical Studies, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences) on *Bulgaro-Hungarian Relations in the Middle Ages*<sup>530</sup> built on and continued the research of Géza Fehér, whose work had been published almost 80 years prior.<sup>531</sup> Drawing on the achievements of 20th-century historical scholarship and a broad range of sources, Dimitrov compiled a kind

---

*INMV* 13 (1977), 57–68; Idem, “Prinosi kŭm istoriyata na krepostite po Dolniya Dunav. VI. Kholŭvnik i Gyurgevo,” *INMV* 14 (1978), 67–80; Idem, “Strategicheskata rolya na krepostite po Dolniya Dunav prez IX–XIII v.,” *INMV* 15 (1979), 25–41; *Bŭlgarski srednovekovni gradove i kreposti*, vol. 1, *Gradove i kreposti po Dunav i Cherno more*, eds. Aleksandŭr Kuzev and Vasil Gyuzelev (Varna: Georgi Bakalov, 1981); Dimcho Momchilov, “Znachenie i mestonakhozhdenie na srednovekovnata krepost Lardea,” *IstPreg* (1988), no. 8, 58–64; Dimitŭr Stoimenov, “Geografski predstavi za Bŭlgariya v rannata srednovekovna arabska geografija,” *IstPreg* (1986), no. 8, 50–9; Elena Koicheva, “Le rôle de Hemus dans le destin historique de la Péninsule Balkanique au moyen age,” *BHR* (2000), no. 1–2, 84–91; Eadem, *Pŭrvite krŭstosnosni pokhodi na Balkanite* (Sofia: Vekove, 2004); Annie Dancheva-Vasileva, “Plovdiv à l’époque des premières Croisades (1097, 1147, 1189),” *BHR* (1998), no. 3, 10–32; Eadem, “Sredetz (Serдика) dans l’histoire politique de l’Empire Byzantin (1018–1195),” *BHR* (2004), no. 1–2, 13–40; Liliyana Simeonova, *Pŭtvane kŭm Konstantinopol: tŭrgoviya i komunikatsii v Sredizemnomorskiya svyat (kraya na IX–70-te godini na XI v.)* (Sofia: Paradigma, 2006).

528 Khristo Dimitrov and Iliya Iliev, “‘Ungarskata khronika’ na Őoan Turotsi ot XV v kato izvor za srednovekovnata istoriya na Bŭlgariya,” *IstPreg* (1988), no. 6, 75–88.

529 *Chronica Hungarorum*, vol. 1, *Textus*, eds. Erzsébet Galántai and Gyula Kristó (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1985). On this and other Hungarian chronicles, see: Gyula Kristó, *Magyar historiográfia I. Történetírás a középkori Magyarországon* (Budapest: Osiris Kiadó, 2002); László Veszprémy, “Historical Past and Political Present in the Latin Chronicles of Hungary (12th–13th Centuries),” in *The Medieval Chronicle. Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on the Medieval Chronicle (Driebergen/Utrecht 13.16 July 1996)*, ed. Erik Kooper, (Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi, 1999), 260–8.

530 Khristo Dimitrov, *Bŭlgarsko-ungarski otnosheniya prez srednovekovieto. Istoricheski izsledvaniya* (Sofia, 1998); Iliya Iliev, “[Review of:] Khristo Dimitrov, *Bŭlgarsko-ungarski otnosheniya prez srednovekovieto. Istoricheski izsledvaniya*. Sofiya: ‘Prof. Marin Drinov’, 1998. 423 c.,” *BHR* (1999), no. 3–4, 216–7.

531 Géza Fehér, *Bulgarisch-Ungarische Beziehungen in den V–XI Jahrhunderten* (Budapest, 1921).



of encyclopedia of the history of the Pontic-Carpathian-Danubian region in the 5th to 15th centuries. The issue of multilateral relations between the Turkic nomads of the North Pontic steppes and Hungary, Bulgaria, and Byzantium occupied a prominent place in the work. Dimitrov specifically considered the main events and developments in the region that involved the Pechenegs. These included, among others, the Magyars' acquisition of their new homeland, Bulgaro-Hungarian, Bulgaro-Byzantine, and Hungaro-Byzantine conflicts during the reign of Tsar Simeon and after his death, Sviatoslav's wars with Byzantium, and the multilateral international relations of the 11th century. Discussing the possible Pecheneg participation in the Bulgaro-Byzantine war of the early 11th century that led to Bulgaria's loss of independence, Dimitrov maintained that the Pechenegs were Bulgaria's allies in this conflict.<sup>532</sup>

In 2011, Dimitrov published a book on *Bulgaria and Nomads until the Beginning of the 11th Century*.<sup>533</sup> In this work, he considered interactions of the Bulgarians as a people and Bulgaria as a state with the Huns, Avars, Khazars, Hungarians, and Pechenegs. He agreed with the view that, from the time of Simeon and until the fall of the Bulgarian state in the 11th century, the Pechenegs remained Bulgaria's allies in the latter's conflicts with the Hungarians, Byzantium, and Rus'. Dimitrov not only concurred with Bozhilov on the issue of the Pechenegs' involvement on Simeon's side in the events of 917, but also questioned the reality of the Pecheneg raid on the Bulgarian lands in 943. According to him, the Pecheneg assault on Kyiv during Sviatoslav's first campaign into Bulgaria was brought about precisely thanks to the efforts of Bulgarian diplomacy, as were the nomads' further activities already on the side of Sviatoslav and his Bulgarian allies (the Battle of Arcadiopolis, 970). Dimitrov also saw the failure of the mission of the Byzantine envoy Theophilos, *archiereus* of Euchaita,<sup>534</sup> to the Pechenegs as the result of Bulgarian activities.<sup>535</sup> An interesting conception of the relationship between the Pechenegs, Hungarians, Bulgaria, and Byzantium in the 10th century was

532 Dimitrov, *Bŭlgarsko-ungarski otnosheniya prez srednovekovieto. Istoricheski izsledvaniya*, 25–37, 60–4, 78–81, 84–5, 93–8.

533 Khristo Dimitrov, *Bŭlgariya i nomadite do nachaloto na XI v.* This was an expanded version of his doctoral dissertation, defended in 1986.

534 Theophilos had to arrange for the safe passage of Sviatoslav and his army back to Rus': *Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsis historiarum*, 309–10. On Theophilos and his identification with different historical figures in historiography, see: Mikhail Raev, "The Russian-Byzantine Treaty of 971: Theophilos and Sveneld," *РЭБ* 64–65 (2006), 329–30, note 3.

535 Dimitrov, *Bŭlgariya i nomadite do nachaloto na XI v.*, 195–247. To substantiate his version of the "eternal friendship" between Bulgaria and the Pechenegs in the 9th to early 11th centuries, Dimitrov even follows Bozhilov in asserting the authenticity of the *Toparcha Gothicus*: *Ibid.*, 241.

developed by Boris Todorov.<sup>536</sup> In his view, the Magyars and Pechenegs not only participated in the wars between the two “sedentary powers,” but also in fact caused the integration of Bulgaria into the Byzantine *oikumene*. Todorov explains the slow westward progress of the Pechenegs towards the Dniester and Danube in the 10th century by the policy of several Bulgarian rulers, especially Tsar Simeon, who tempted the nomads with gifts, titles, and dynastic marriages. The nomads were also enticed by the opportunity to extract benefits from Bulgaria’s rival, Byzantium. Overall, up until Sviatoslav’s expeditions, devastating for Bulgaria, the latter was a “society-structuring factor in the nomadic world.”

A distinctive feature of the works of Tüpkova-Zaimova, Bozhilov, Dimitrov and a number of other Bulgarian historians of the 1960s–1980s was their reliance mainly on written sources; archaeology played only an illustrative role in their arguments. The present generation of Bulgarian historians, on the other hand, shows a readiness to embrace various types of sources, as evidenced by the studies of Teodora Krumova and Īoto Valeriev on the history of Pecheneg-Byzantine relations.

Krumova,<sup>537</sup> in her essay on “Pecheneg Chieftains in the Byzantine Administration,”<sup>538</sup> generally adheres to Atanasov’s theory that vast stretches of Dobruja and northern Bulgaria were depopulated as a result of Pecheneg raids and then settled by the nomads themselves, whose chieftains were granted by Constantinople broad powers for ruling the region. Following Tüpkova-Zaimova, Krumova writes that “a system similar to the former *stratigotes* system was established in the frontier zone of Paristrion.”<sup>539</sup> Discussing

536 Boris Todorov, “The Value of Empire: Tenth-Century Bulgaria between Magyars, Pechenegs and Byzantium,” *Journal of Medieval History* 36 (2010), no. 4, 312–26. The article draws on Thomas J. Barfield’s and Anatolii M. Khazanov’s studies in the theory of nomadism.

537 Krumova has also analysed other finds linked to the Pechenegs: Eadem, “Secondary Usage of Pecheneg Bridlebosses as Dress Decoration,” *AB* 5 (2001), no. 3, 65–70. In 2001, she defended a Master’s thesis on “The Pecheneg Bridle.” [Manuscript – MA Thesis in Medieval Studies, Central European University] (Budapest, 2001).

538 Teodora Krumova, “Pecheneg Chieftains in the Byzantine Administration in the Theme of Paristrion in the Eleventh Century,” in *Annual of Medieval Studies at the CEU* 11 (2005), 207–21.

539 *Ibid.*, 212. Elsewhere, Krumova notes that the nomads were settled in the status of *foederati* (*Ibid.*, 214), even though these are two different systems of border defense. *Strateia*’s service was personal and tied to property (see: Alexandr P. Kazhdan, “Strateia,” in *ODB*, 3, 1965), while the status of *foederati* was collective (Idem, “Foederati,” in *ODB*, 2, 794). Perhaps in this case it is more appropriate to speak of *symmachoi* (Madgearu, “The Pechenegs in the Byzantine Army,” 211). Interestingly, in discussing the Pechenegs Krumova uses some rather modern expressions: “[Pechenegs] appeared under the walls of Drastar asking for Byzantine citizenship” (Krumova, “Pecheneg chieftains in the Byzantine

the province of Paristrion, Krumova uses the term *μιξοβάρβαροι* to denote the local population and the settled, partially Christianized nomads.<sup>540</sup> She argues that the self-proclaimed chieftain Tatous, active in the 1070s, belonged to this category<sup>541</sup> and stresses that Tatous and the population he represented were radically different from the Pechenegs of Kegen and Tyrach.

Īoto Valeriev defended a doctoral thesis on “The Bulgarian Lands and Late Nomadic Invasions, End of the 11th to 12th Centuries” in 2015.<sup>542</sup> He has authored several publications on the history of Byzantine-nomadic wars<sup>543</sup> and attempted to summarize the best-known coin finds in Bulgaria and the neighboring countries and correlate them with the events of the 10th to 12th centuries in the Balkans.<sup>544</sup>

It would seem that, given their role in the history of Bulgaria, especially in the restoration of Bulgarian statehood in the 12th century, the Cumans should occupy a special place in Bulgarian historiography. However, as the medievalist Khristo Kolarov once acknowledged, Bulgarian scholars have never accorded this people the attention it deserves.<sup>545</sup> Among the few exceptions, the Bulgarian student of the historiography and language of the Cumans Valeri

---

administration,” 210). A “modernizing” approach to medieval Byzantine-nomadic relations is also noticeable in the work of Kazimir Popkonstantinov and Rossina Kostova: Kazimir Popkonstantinov and Rossina Kostova, “Minorities and Foreigners in Bulgarian Medieval Towns 12th–14th c.: Literary and Archaeological Fragments,” in *Segregation – Integration – Assimilation. Religious and Ethnic Groups in the Medieval Towns of Central and Eastern Europe*, eds. Derek Keene et al. (Aldershot: Routledge, 2009), 147–9.

540 Krumova cites as an argument in her favor Doncheva-Petkova’s conclusions about the burials in the necropolis No. 2 near Odŭrtsi and burials of a similar type in Pliska and Preslav: *Ibid.*, 214–8. It remains unclear how the local population could be part of the *μιξοβάρβαροι* if, according to the earlier statements, it had left the area.

541 On Tatous, see: Plamen Pavlov, “Belezhki za nyakoi lichnosti ot bŭlgarskoto srednovekovie s ogleđ istoriyata na Dobrudzha prez XI–XIII v.,” *Dobrudzha* 9 (1992), 169–77.

542 *Idem*, *Bŭlgarskite zemi i nashestviyata na kŭsnite nomadi v kraya na XI–XII v.* [Ph.D. thesis] (Sofia, 2015).

543 Īoto Valeriev and N. Nikolov, “Pokhodŭt na Aleksii I Komnin kŭm Drŭstŭr (1087 g.) Novi dannii i interpretatsiya,” *Pŭtuvane kŭm Bŭlgariya* 1 (2009), 432–47; Īoto Valeriev, “The Dristra Battle (1087),” *Cultura Ńi civilizatię la Dunărea de Jos* 24 (2008), 257–67; *Idem*, “Oshte za vizantiisko-kumanskata voina ot 1148 g.,” *Pŭtuvane kŭm Bŭlgariya* 3 (2014), 417–30.

544 Valeriev, “Kŭm istoriyata i arheologiyata na zemite na Dolniya Dunav prez Srednovekovieto: sbornite monetni nakhodki ot teritoriyata na Bŭlgariya, Sŭrbiya i Rumŭniya (969–1180).”

545 Khristo Kolarov, *Srednovekovna bŭlgarska dŭrzhava (uredba, kharakteristika, otnosheniya Ńs Ńsŭsednite narodi)* (Veliko Tarnovo: Universitetsko izdatelstvo “Sv. sv. Kiril i Metodii,” 1977), 133. Valeri Stoyanov agrees: Stoyanov, *Kumanologiya: Istoriografski eskizi*, 2, 356.

Stoyanov<sup>546</sup> singles out the philologist Mefküre Mollova, who examined the *Codex Cumanicus* and names of Turkic origin in the Balkans,<sup>547</sup> and the historian Plamen Pavlov, who in 1991 defended a thesis on “Bulgaria, Byzantium, and the Cumans.”<sup>548</sup> The history of the Cumans in the Balkans has also been studied by Aleksandür Nikolov, Luchezar Krüstev, and Konstantin Golev.<sup>549</sup>

## 5 Historiography of Other Countries in the Region

Various Turkic peoples inhabited the territory of today’s Slovakia beginning in the 5th century. In 1543–1686, parts of the Slovak lands were under the rule of the Ottoman Empire. The Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans also left their mark in the archaeology, toponymy, and history of Slovakia, and therefore nomadic history is part of the country’s national history.<sup>550</sup> Pecheneg-Byzantine relations have been considered by the Slovak historians Vratislav Zervan and Marek Meško. While Zervan focuses on what the *DAI* and Oriental sources say

546 In addition to historiographical works, Stoyanov has written on the role of the Cumans in the history of Bulgaria: Idem, “Kumans in Bulgarian History (Eleventh–Fourteenth Centuries),” in *The Turks*, 1, 680–9.

547 Stoyanov, *Kumanologiya: Istoriografski eskizi*, 2, 343–52, 356. On the possible survivals of the languages of the Pechenegs and Cumans in the Bulgarian language and anthroponyms, see also: Mosko Moskov, “Küm voprosa za pechenezhko-kumanskiya superstrat v bülgarskiya ezik,” *Izvestiya na instituta za bülgarskiya ezik* 8 (1962), 151–61; Valeri Stoyanov, *Istoriya na izuchavaneto na Codex Cumanicus. Kumano-pechenezhki antroponimi v Bülgariya prez XV vek* (Sofia: Ogledalo, 2000).

548 Plamen Pavlov, *Bülgariya, Vizantiya i kumanite* [Ph.D. thesis] (Veliko Tarnovo, 1991), Idem, “Za ruskoto prisústvie na Dolni Dunav i bülgaro-ruskite vrüzki prez XI–XII v.,” *Dobrudzha* 3 (1986), 11–20; Idem, “Po vüprosa za zaselvaniyata na kumani v Bülgariya prez XIII v.,” Idem, “Kumanite v obshtestveno-politicheskiya zhivot na srednoviekovna Bülgariya (1186 g. – nachaloto na XIV v.),” *IstPreg* (1990), no. 7, 17–26. See also: Stoyanov, *Kumanologiya: Istoriografski eskizi*, 2, 353–68; Idem, “Polovtsy vo vnutripoliticheskoy zhizni Vizantii i Bolgarii XIII–XIV vv.,” *Stratum plus* (2009), no. 6, 388–404.

549 Aleksandür Nikolov, *The Cumanic Settlement in Bulgaria and Hungary in the Thirteenth Century and Its Consequences* [Ph.D. thesis] (Budapest, 1996); Luchezar Krüstev, “Etnicheskiýyat süstav i razseleniyata na Kumanite,” *IstPreg* (2003), no. 5–6, 172–86; Konstantin Golev, *Prichini za kumanskite migratsii na Balkanite* [Ph.D. thesis] (Sofia, 2013); Idem, “The Cuman-Qipchaqs and Crimea: The Role of the Peninsula in the Nomads’ Relations with the Outside World,” *AEMAE* (2018), 24, 23–107.

550 Josef Blaskovics, “Some Toponyms of Turkic Origin in Slovakia,” *Acta Orientalia ASH* 27 (1973), no. 2, 191–9; Miloš Marek, “Dávne etniká na stredovekom Slovensku (Kovari, Chvalizi, Kumáni a Jasi),” *Historický zborník* 13 (2003), no. 1–2, 35–53; Idem, “Pečenehovia a Uzi na Slovensku,” *Historický časopis* 51 (2003), no. 2, 193–222.

about the Pechenegs,<sup>551</sup> for Meško the struggle of the Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans against Byzantium in the second half of the 11th to early 12th century is the main area of interest, to which he has dedicated numerous articles and a book.<sup>552</sup>

Meško developed his own understanding of the history of Pecheneg groups in the Balkans.<sup>553</sup> In his view, due to pressure from the Uzes, by the mid-11th century the Pechenegs had already lost their pastures and tribal organization described by Constantine Porphyrogenitus: the number of Pecheneg tribes had fallen from 40 to 13.<sup>554</sup> After their invasion of Byzantium and a bloody war, Constantine IX set them up in Paristrion,<sup>555</sup> which effectively led to their split into three groups: the Pechenegs of Paristrion and the Pechenegs north of the Danube, who in turn preserved the division into a right and left wing characteristic of this and other Turkic peoples. The Pechenegs of Paristrion, mixing with Bulgarians and Vlachs, started to form a new ethnic group, which Byzantine authors described as *μιξοβάρβαροι*; in 1074, they embarked on a struggle to create a political entity of their own.<sup>556</sup> It was this group that caused

551 Vratislav Zervan, “Úloha Pečenehov v kríze euroázijskej stepi 9. storočí na základe informácii Konstantína Porfyrogeneta,” *Byzantinoslovaca* 1 (2006), 161–74.

552 Idem, *Obnova byzantskej moci na Balkáne za vlády Alexia I. Komnéna. Druhá byzantsko-pečenežská vojna (1083-1091)*.

553 Marek Meško, “Pecheneg Groups in the Balkans (ca. 1053–1091) According to the Byzantine Sources,” in *The Steppe Lands and the World beyond Them*, 179–205.

554 Ibid., 180–1. Conversely, in Schmitt’s view, the number of Pecheneg tribes increased from eight to thirteen (Oliver J. Schmitt, “Die Petschenegen auf dem Balkan von 1046 bis 1072,” in *Pontos Euxeinus. Beiträge zur Archäologie und Geschichte des antiken Schwarzmeer und Balkanraumes. Manfred Oppermann zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Sven Conrad (Langenweissbach: Beier & Beran, 2006), 476). This problem cannot be solved by simply comparing the numbers (eight and thirteen or forty and thirteen). According to the *DAI*, Patzinakia consisted of eight *θέματα* (translated in the Moravcsik-Jenkins edition as “provinces”: *Constantine Porphyrogenitus, De Administrando Imperio*, 1, 166–7) and was governed by *μεγάλοι ἄρχοντες* (Ibid.). At the same time, the Pecheneg lands were divided into forty “districts” (*μέρη*), governed by “minor princelings” (*ἐλάττονες ἄρχοντες*). Skylitzes, in his turn, instead of *themes* speaks of thirteen *γενεαί* (*Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsis historiarum*, 455) – “tribes,” in Wortley’s translation: *John Skylitzes. A synopsis of Byzantine history, 811-1057*, (transl. John Wortley, 426). So, the question arises: what should we compare Skylitzes’ *γενεαί* with – *θέματα* or *μέρη*? Interestingly, Mark Whittow believes that the Byzantine word *θέμα* derives from the Turkic “tumen” – ten thousand horsemen: Mark Whittow, *The Making of Byzantium, 600-1025* (Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1996), 120.

555 On the Byzantine defense system in Paristrion, see: Marek Meško, “Vývin obranného systému Byzantskej ríše v 11. storočí – príklad témy Paradounavon,” *Byzantinoslovaca* 1 (2006), 128–43.

556 Meško, “Pecheneg Groups in the Balkans (ca. 1053–1091) According to the Byzantine Sources,” 190; Idem, *Obnova byzantskej moci na Balkáne za vlády Alexia I. Komnéna*, 224–5.

Byzantium the most trouble in the second half of the 11th century, up until the Battle of Levounion.

Conversely, the “northern” Pechenegs, according to Meško, sided with Byzantium in most conflicts since the mid-11th century, and only twice became cause for concern: when one of the tribes relocated south of the Danube in the 1070s<sup>557</sup> and when Chelgu Khan<sup>558</sup> invaded the imperial lands together with the ex-king of Hungary Salomon in the spring of 1087. Meško identifies as the root cause of the Pecheneg-Byzantine antagonism of the last quarter of the 11th century the overpopulation of the area between the Haemus and Danube and the nomads’ inability to sustain their traditional economy.<sup>559</sup> Beginning with support for various rebels, the Pechenegs’ enmity towards the empire eventually erupted in the events that Meško terms “the war of 1083–91.”

Meško’s monograph on this Byzantine-Pecheneg war is an important contribution to the study of the problem of Byzantium’s relations with North Pontic nomads. He pays close attention to source criticism<sup>560</sup> and to the war’s civilizational<sup>561</sup> and geographical aspects,<sup>562</sup> largely ignored by earlier scholarship. He also offers a meticulous analysis of the timeline of the conflict<sup>563</sup> and

- 
- 557 Idem, “Pecheneg Groups in the Balkans (ca. 1053–1091) According to the Byzantine Sources,” 191.
- 558 In Meško’s view, he commanded the right wing of the “northern” Pechenegs, and Khan Kutesk – the left wing. Meško surmises that Kutesk’s Pechenegs roamed the lands of Moldavia, and Chelgu’s – the Wallachian Plain: Meško, *Obnova byzantskej moci na Balkáne za vlády Alexia I. Komnéna*, 225–6; Idem, “Pecheneg Groups in the Balkans (ca. 1053–1091) According to the Byzantine Sources,” 195–7. His hypothesis that the leader of the Pechenegs’ right wing had precedence over that of the left wing is based on Pritsak’s statement. See: Omeljan Pritsak, “Pechenihy,” *Ukrayins’kyi istoryk* 25–27 (1970), no. 1–3, 96. Pritsak speaks of the opposite order of precedence among the Cumans: Idem, “Polovtsi,” *Ukrayins’kyi istoryk* 37–38 (1977), 114.
- 559 Meško, “Pecheneg Groups in the Balkans (ca. 1053–1091) According to the Byzantine Sources,” 192.
- 560 Idem, *Obnova byzantskej moci na Balkáne za vlády Alexia I. Komnéna*, 68–91; Idem, “An Overview of Byzantine Sources about the Pechenegs,” in *On Research Methodology in Ancient and Byzantine History*, eds. Jarmila Bednaříková et al. (Brno: Masaryk University, 2015), 169–79.
- 561 Building on the Orientalists Denis Sinor’s and Rudi Paul Lindner’s attempt to work out the area of pasture necessary for grazing horses (which nomadic archers needed), Meško deduced the approximate number of Pecheneg fighting men in the Balkans in the second half of the 11th century. In his view, it could not have been higher than 50 thousand horsemen: Marek Meško, “K veľkosti pečenežských zoskupení (hòrd) na Balkáne v druhej polovici 11. storočia,” *Byzantinoslovaca* 4 (2012), 17–27.
- 562 Meško, *Obnova byzantskej moci na Balkáne za vlády Alexia I. Komnéna*, 92–101.
- 563 *Ibid.*, 101–20; Idem, “Notes sur la chronologie de la guerre des Byzantins contre les Petchénègues (1083–1091),” *BS* 69 (2011), 134–148.

examines in depth its military aspect.<sup>564</sup> Meško divides the war of 1083–91 into three periods: plunder raids by the Paristrion Pechenegs, who took advantage of the fact that the Byzantine army was tied up in other theaters (1083–86);<sup>565</sup> the invasion of Salomon and Chelgu, which ended in victory for the Byzantines in the Battle of Koule (1087), with the domestic political conflict escalating and becoming international;<sup>566</sup> and the period when Alexios Komnenos decided to put a stop to the depredations of the Pechenegs,<sup>567</sup> concentrating a large military force in the west, bringing in foreign mercenaries (including nomadic Turkic warlords), and cultivating external support,<sup>568</sup> which the Pechenegs were doing as well (1087–91).<sup>569</sup> Despite their initial major defeat at Dristra,<sup>570</sup> the Byzantines won the war and eliminated the danger from Paristrion for a long time to come. The coming of the Cumans to Byzantium’s side became the decisive factor.<sup>571</sup>

Marek Meško also has not ignored the last nomadic incursion into Byzantium in the 11th century<sup>572</sup> and the last Pecheneg attack in the 12th century.<sup>573</sup> According to Meško, the reason for the Cuman raid across the Danube was their involvement in the struggle between Rus’ and Byzantium for Tamartarcha. In his article on the Battle of Beroia, Meško rejects the possibility that it was a Cuman, rather than Pecheneg, raid and attempts to establish more precisely the date and place of the decisive battle. Given that Meško has not lost interest

- 
- 564 In 2007–2010, Meško worked as research fellow at the Institute of Military History in Bratislava.
- 565 Idem, *Obnova byzantskej moci na Balkáne za vlády Alexia I. Komnéna*, 121–42.
- 566 Ibid., 142–59. Meško devotes a special study to Pecheneg participation in the later military activities of the Hungarian king Salomon: Idem, “Pečenežsko-byzantské dobrodružstvo uhorského kráľa Šalamúna (1083-1087),” *Konštantínove listy* 4 (2011), 77–94.
- 567 Idem, “Snaha Byzancie o konečné riešenie pečenežského problému: Výprava Alexia I. Komnéna proti Dristre roku 1087,” *Medea. Studia mediaevalia et antiqua* 9 (2005), 6–20.
- 568 On Byzantine diplomacy in the North Pontic region, see: Idem, “Byzancia a nomádi. Byzantská diplomacia na čiernomorskej stepi,” *Historická revue* 20 (2009), no. 7–8, 66–73; Idem, “Nomads and Byzantium. Problematic Aspects of Maintaining Diplomatic Relations with the Pechenegs,” in *On Research Methodology in Ancient and Byzantine History*, 181–93. On the emperor seeking support in the West, see: Idem, “Otázka pravosti a datovania listu Alexia I. Komnéna grófovi Róbertovi z Flámska,” *Byzantinoslovaca* 3 (2010), 64–71.
- 569 Idem, *Obnova byzantskej moci na Balkáne za vlády Alexia I. Komnéna*, 204.
- 570 Idem, “Some Thoughts on the Military Capabilities of Alexios I Komnenos: Battles of Dyrrachion (1081) and Dristra (1087),” *Graeco-Latina Brunensia* 24 (2019), no. 2, 143–61.
- 571 Idem, *Obnova byzantskej moci na Balkáne za vlády Alexia I. Komnéna*, 225–8.
- 572 Idem, “Nová pravdepodobná príčina kumánskeho vpádu na byzantský Balkán roku 1095,” *Byzantinoslovaca* 5 (2014), 192–204.
- 573 Idem, “Bitka pri Beroe 1122: Posledný boj Pečenehov,” *Vojenská história* 11 (2007), no. 4, 3–26.

in the history of Byzantine-nomadic relations, we can expect from him new studies on the subject.

Even though the late nomads and Byzantium were also involved in events that took place in the lands of present-day Greece, Turkey, Serbia, Albania, North Macedonia, and other countries of the Balkan-Danubian region,<sup>574</sup> the overall contribution of historians from these countries to the subject of the present study is much smaller than that of Hungarian, Romanian, and Bulgarian scholars. This may be due to the weak connection between the history of the Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans and the respective “national” histories.

For the Greek historian Alexios Savvides of Peloponnesos University, the journey towards the study of the late nomads in the Balkans began with research on Seljuk-Byzantine relations.<sup>575</sup> In 1985, he published a long article on the relations between the Cumans and Constantinople<sup>576</sup> and another one on the Pecheneg-Byzantine war of 1122–23,<sup>577</sup> and in 1993 – an essay on the Oghuz Turks and a prosopographical study on Kegen.<sup>578</sup> His other important contributions include a summary of the role of the pre-Ottoman Turkic

- 
- 574 Pecheneg raids reached the territory of modern Turkey and Greece. Byzantium settled Pechenegs in the vicinity of Nish (Serbia), Ovče Pole (North Macedonia), and Moglena (now Almopia, Greece). In 1072, a Byzantine garrison consisting of Pechenegs was stationed in Belgrade. In 1096, also near Belgrade, a Pecheneg force attacked the Crusaders. There are traces of nomads in the local toponymy: Pečenjevce (Jablanica district, Serbia), the town of Kumanovo in North Macedonia, and others.
- 575 Alexios Savvides, *To Vyzántio kai oi Seltzoúkoι Tourkoι ton no ai.* (Athens: Domos, 1980); Idem, *Byzantium in the Near East: Its Relations with the Seljuk Sultanate of Rûm in Asia Minor, the Armenians of Cilicia and the Mongols AD c.1192-1237* (Vyzantiná keimena kai melétoi, 17) (Thessaloniki: University of Thessaloniki, 1981). Perhaps the impetus for the study of the history of Byzantium's relations with the Pechenegs and Cumans was given by the episodes, described by Anna Komnene, in which Emir Tzachas and the Pechenegs acted together: Idem, “O Seltzoúkos emírís tis Smýrnis Tzachás (Čaka) kai oi epidromés tou sta mikrasiatiká parália, ta nisiá tou Anatolikou Aigaíou kai tin Konstantinoúpoli, c.1081–c.1106,” *Chiaká Chroniká* 14 (1982), 9–24; 16 (1984), 51–66.
- 576 Idem, “Oi Kománoi (Koumánoi) kai to Vyzántio, 1108–1308 ai. m.Ch.,” *Vyzantiná* 13 (1985), 937–57. Elizabeth A. Zachariadou (1931–2018) wrote about Cumans in Trabzon: Elizabeth A. Zachariadou, “Noms coumans à Trébizonde,” *RÉB* 53 (1995), 285–8.
- 577 Alexios Savvides, “I teleftaía patzinakikí epidromí sto Vyzántio. 1122–1123 m.Ch.,” *Parnassós* 27 (1985), 493–507.
- 578 Idem, “Kegénis, o Patzinákos patríkios sta méssa tou 1100 ai.,” in *Praktiká XIII Panellínou Istorikou Synedriou* (Thessaloniki: Vánias, 1993), 143–155; Idem, “Byzantines and the Oghuz (Ghuzz). Some Observations on the Nomenclature,” *BS* 54 (1993), 147–55.



peoples in the history of Byzantium,<sup>579</sup> historiographical works,<sup>580</sup> and publications and analysis of sources.<sup>581</sup>

Telemachos C. Lounghis devoted several works to the study of the writings of Constantine Porphyrogenitus and the dating of the *De Thematibus* and offered an explanation for why the author of the *DAI* spoke so much about the Pechenegs, Rus', and Magyars but almost never mentioned such powerful players of that period as the Arabs, Franks, Bulgars, or Khazars. In his view, the reason for this imbalance was Constantine's adherence to the doctrine of "limited ecumenism," espoused by the Macedonian dynasty (867–1057), as opposed to the Roman principle of limitless imperialism.<sup>582</sup> In his 1996 talk at the 19th Congress of Byzantine Studies in Copenhagen, Lounghis considered the trends and directions of Byzantium's policy towards its Eastern European neighbors, including the Pechenegs.<sup>583</sup>

Giasmína Moyseidou of the University in Ioannina defended a thesis on "Byzantium's Relations with Its Northern Neighbors in the 10th Century" in 1993.<sup>584</sup> Questioning Franz Dölger's and George Ostrogorsky's<sup>585</sup> view of the

579 Idem, *Oi Tourkoi kai to Vyzántio*, vol. 1, *Pro-othomaniká fýla stin Asía kai sta Valkánia* (Athens: Domos, 1996).

580 Idem, "Oi Vyzantinoí apénanti stous laoús tou anatolikou kai tou valkanikou kósmou: me émfasi sta tourkófona fýla," in *Vyzantinó krátos kai koinonía. Sýnchrones katefthýnseis tis érevnas*, eds. Stylianos Lampakis et al. (Athens: Ethnikó Idryma Erevnón Iródotos, 2003), 125–55.

581 Idem, "Notes on al-Idrisi, Byzantium and the Balkans (On the Occasion of a New Publication Concerning the 'Kitab al-Rujar's' Balkan section," *BS* 60 (1999), 447–58; Idem, *Vyzantinó istoriografikó pentáptycho. Prokópios – Michail Psellós – Anna Komniní – Ioánnis Kínnamos – Geórgios Sfrantzís. Symvolí gia tous istoriográfous kai tin epochí tous* (Thessaloniki: Myrmidones, 2001).

582 Telemachos C. Lounghis, "Sur la date du 'De thematibus' de Constantin Porphyrogénète," *RÉB* 31 (1973), 299–305; Idem, "L'historiographie de l'époque macédonienne et la domination byzantine sur les peuples du sud-est européen d'après les traités de paix du IXe siècle," *Balkan Studies* 21 (1980), 69–86; Idem, *Konstantínou VII' Porfyrogénitou De Administrando Imperio (Pros ton ídion yión Romanón): mia méthodos anágnosis* (Thessaloniki, 1990); Idem, "Die byzantinische Ideologie der 'begrenzten Ökumene' und die römische Frage im ausgehenden 10. Jahrhundert," *BS* 56 (1995), 117–28.

583 Idem, "Über die zwei gegensätzlichen Richtungen der byzantinischen Außenpolitik im osteuropäischen Raum im 10. Jahrhundert," in *Byzanz und Ostmitteleuropa 950-1453*, 35–43.

584 The dissertation was published in 1995 with a slightly different title: Giasmína Moyseidou, *To Vyzántio kai oi vóreioi geitonés tou ton 10-o aióna* (Athens: Vasilópoulos Stéfanos D., 1995).

585 Ostrogorsky, "Die byzantinische Staatenhierarchie"; Franz Dölger "Die 'Familie der Könige' im Mittelalter," *Historisches Jahrbuch* 60 (1940), 397–420.

Byzantine emperor as the universal ruler of the *oikumene* who treated neighboring princes as “sons” and “friends,”<sup>586</sup> Moyseidou considered the empire’s relations with the rulers of Bulgaria, Rus’, Hungary, the Pechenegs,<sup>587</sup> Khazars, and Southern Slavs. Christos Kyriazopoulos of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, in his monograph on the history of Thrace in the 10th to 12th centuries, devotes special chapters to the Pechenegs, Cumans, and Uzes.<sup>588</sup> Theocharis Alexopoulos has written on the wars of Alexios I Komnenos against the Pechenegs.<sup>589</sup>

In addition to general works on the history of Byzantium,<sup>590</sup> the late nomads of the North Pontic steppes occasionally figure in studies by Greek historians devoted to individual periods and historical figures (including saints, as in the essay by Vasilis Kacaros),<sup>591</sup> source criticism,<sup>592</sup> and the like. Odysseas Gilis compiled an anthology of Greek testimony on the Turkic peoples.<sup>593</sup> I am not

586 Moyseidou, *To Vyzántio kai oi véreioi geitonés tou ton 10-o aióna*, 57.

587 Ibid., 227–63.

588 Christos Kyriazopoulos, *I Thráki katá tous 100-120 aiónes: symvolí sti meléti tis politikís, dioiketikís kai ekklesiastikís tis exélexi* [Ph.D. thesis] (Thessaloniki, 1997), 118–30.

589 Theocharis Alexopoulos, “Using Ancient Military Handbooks to Fight Medieval Battles: Two Stratagems used by Alexios I Komnenos against the Normans and the Pechenegs,” *Heóa kai espéria* 8 (2012), 47–71.

590 Dionysios A. Zakythinos, *Vyzantiní Istoría, 324-1071* (Athens: Dodoni, 1977); Ioannis Karagiannopoulos, *Istoría tou Vyzantinou Krátous*, vol. 2, *Istoría mésis vyzantinís periódou (565-1081)*; vol. 3, *Istoría ystéras vyzantinís periódou (1081-1453)*, part 1: *Teleftaies lámpseis (1081-1204)* (Thessaloniki: Vánias, 1991); Aikaterini Christofilopoulou, *Vyzantiní Istoría*, vol. 2, part 2, *867-1081* (Thessaloniki: Vánias, 1997).

591 Georgios T. Kólías, “I exoterikí politikí Alexíou A’ Komninoú (1081-1118),” *Athiná* 59 (1955), 241–88; Apostolou Glavinas, *I epí Alexíou Komninoú (1081-1118) perí ierón skevón, keimilion kai agíon eikónon éris (1081-1095)* (Thessaloniki: Kéntro Vyzantinón Erevnón, 1972), 133–5; Mártha Grigoriou-Ioannídou, “I vyzantinovoulgarikí sýnkrousi stous Katasýrtes (917),” *Epistimonikí Epetirída Filosofikís Scholís tou Aristoteleíou Panepistimíou Thessaloníkis* 21 (1983), 123–48; Evángelos K. Kyriakis, *Vyzántio kai Voulgaroi, 708-1008 ai.* (Athens: Vasilópoulos Stéfanos D., 1993); Panagiotis Antonopoulos, “Byzantium, the Magyar Raids and Their Consequences,” *BS* 54 (1993), no. 2, 254–67; Idem, *O aftokrátoras Konstantínos VII’ Porfyrogénittos kai oi Oúngroi* (Athens: Vasilópoulos Stéfanos D., 1996); Vasilis Katsaros, “Ágios Geórgios o Gorgós: I alligorikí ermeneía stin ennoiologikí metállaxi tou epithétou,” *ZRVI* 50 (2013), no. 1, 505–19.

592 Alkmínis Staurídou-Zafráka, *I synántisi Symeón kai Nikoláou Mystikou (Ávgoustos 913) sta pláisia tou vyzantinovoulgarikou antagonismoú* (Thessaloniki: Kéntro Vyzantinón Erevnón, 1972); Apóstolos Karpozèlos, *Symvolí sti meléti tou viou kai tou érgou tou Ioánni Mavrópodos* (Ioannina: Dekémvrios, 1979).

593 Odysseas Gilis, *Tourkia, Tourkiká, Toúrkoi, Mousoulmánoi, Islám, Moamethanoí, Cházaroi, Tourkománoi* (Thessaloniki, 2015). Available at <https://bit.ly/3nHN8kw>. Accessed on 10 March 2020.

aware of any archaeological finds in modern Greece that could be attributed to the Pechenegs or Cumans.

The “archaeological presence” of the late nomads in the countries of the former Yugoslavia, on the other hand, is certain. Gordana Marjanović-Vujović (1934–94) wrote an article on the finds of kettles with inside ears in three different areas of Belgrade.<sup>594</sup> Taking into account information from the *Chronicon Pictum* and Albert of Aachen’s *Historia Hierosolymitanae Expeditionis*, Marjanović-Vujović argues that during the events of 1071–72 and 1096 the Pechenegs were positioned on the right bank of the Sava, near Belgrade, in the Byzantine territory, and if necessary in Belgrade itself, which implies that the Byzantine government had settled them as an auxiliary military force on the northwestern border of the empire.<sup>595</sup> Fragments of similar kettles were also found in Branicevo (ancient Viminacium, Byzantine Βρανίτζοβα, near the village of Stari Kostolac in Serbia), in Vojvodina (Sremska Mitrovica, Pančevo, Kovin, Kovačica, Čortanovci, and other sites), and Western Bosnia.<sup>596</sup> In Gamzigrad (near Zaječar, Serbia), in addition to kettle fragments, silver-encrusted stirrups were found, which Serbian archaeologists attribute to the Pechenegs,<sup>597</sup> at the Trnjane site (Požarevac, Serbia) – a characteristically nomadic firesteel,<sup>598</sup> in Čuprija (medieval Ravno, today’s Pomoravlje district, Serbia) – a nomadic personal ornament;<sup>599</sup> in Tomaševac (Vojvodina province,

594 Marjanović-Vujović, “Archaeological Proving the Presence of the Pechenegs in Beograd Town,” fig. 1 on p. 184. Vesna Bikić does not generally reject the idea that the kettles of this type may be Pecheneg, but, under the influence of Hungarian archaeologists (István Fodor and Miklós Takács), is inclined to believe that the kettle fragments found in Belgrade came from the north – from Hungary, rather than Dobruja and northern Bulgaria: Vesna Bikić, *Srednjovekovna keramika Beograda*, 62.

595 Ibid., 187–8. The testimony of the Hungarian and Byzantine sources on the Hungaro-Byzantine war of 1071–72 with Pecheneg participation has provoked a full-scale debate between Serbian and Hungarian historians around the question of the extent of Hungary’s borders in the second half of the 11th century: Militsa Janković and Đorđe Janković, “Podunavski gradovi pomenuti kao postradali 1072. godine,” *Godišnjak Muzeja grada Beograda* 25 (1978), 41–57; Ivana Komatina and Predrag Komatina, “Vizantijski i ugarski Srem od X do XIII veka,” *ZRVI* 55 (2018), 150–2.

596 Marko Popović and Vujadin Ivanišević, “Grad Branicevo u srednjem veku,” *Starinar* 39 (1988), 146, fig. 17/13–14; Irma Čremošnik, “Nalazi keramike u obliku kotlova na našoj teritoriji,” *Zbornik Narodnog muzeja* 7 (1975), 277–85; Bikić, *Srednjovekovna keramika Beograda*, 61–2.

597 Aleksandar Uzelac, “Skitski razbojnici u Bugarskoj pustinji. Pogled jednog hodočasnika na Pomoravlje sredinom XI veka,” *Istorijski časopis* 59 (2010), 73.

598 Gordana Marjanović-Vujović, *Trnjane – srpska nekropola (kraj XI–početak XIII veka)* (Belgrade, 1984), 101–2.

599 Vesna Manojlović-Nikolić, “Srednjovekovni nakit iz Čuprije – Ravno,” *Istraživanja* 16 (2005), 183–4.

Serbia) – a Cuman belt.<sup>600</sup> The Bosnian archaeologist Alojz Benac (1914–92), studying medieval tombstones in Bosnia and Herzegovina, noted that their imagery featured horsemen and reflected perceptions of the universe characteristic of the medieval Turkic nomads.<sup>601</sup>

Important for the study of the history of Pecheneg raids deep into the territory of Byzantium are the finds of Byzantine coins and seals published by Božidar Ferjančić (1929–98), Ljubomir Maksimović (Institute for Byzantine Studies, Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts), Vujadin Ivanišević (Belgrade Archaeological Institute), Vesna Radić (National Museum, Belgrade), Marko Popović (Belgrade Archaeological Institute), Robert Mihajlovski, Zoran Rujak, and Bojana Krsmanović (Institute for Byzantine Studies, SASA).<sup>602</sup> Serbian scholarship on Byzantine fortifications and the organization of Byzantine rule in the Balkans is also of major significance.<sup>603</sup> The study of the administrative

600 Marin Brmbolić, “The Khuman Belt from the Area of Tomaševac,” *Starinar* 47 (1996), 273–7.

601 Alojz Benac, “Die Gräber in Bosnien und der Herzegovina,” in *Steine der Bogomilen*, eds. Oto Bihalji-Merin and Alojz Benac (Vienna/Munich: Verlag Anton Schroll, 1964), XXXIV–XXXIX.

602 Božidar Ferjančić, “Vizantijski pečat iz Sirmijuma,” *ZRVI* 21 (1982), 47–52; Ljubomir Maksimović and Marko Popović, “Les sceaux byzantins de la région danubienne en Serbie,” *SBS* 2 (1990), 213–34; Ljubomir Maksimović and Marko Popović, “Les sceaux byzantins de la région danubienne en Serbie. II. La collection du Musée National de Belgrade,” *SBS* 3 (1993), 113–42; Vujadin Ivanišević and Bojana Krsmanović, “Byzantine Seals from the Ras Fortress,” *ZRVI* 50 (2013), no. 1, 449–60; Vujadin Ivanišević, “Vizantijski novac (491–1092) iz zbirke Narodnog muzeja u Požarevcu,” *Numizmatičar* 11 (1988), 87–99; Idem, “Vizantijski novac (1092–1261) iz zbirke Narodnog muzeja u Požarevcu,” *Numizmatičar* 14 (1991), 57–72; Idem, “Rimski i vizantijski pečati i medaljoni iz zbirke Narodnog muzeja u Požarevcu,” *Numizmatičar* 15 (1992), 47–52; Idem, “Opticaj vizantijskih folisa XXI veka na prostoru Centralnog Balkana,” *Numizmatičar* 16 (1993), 79–92; Vesna Radić and Vujadin Ivanišević, *Vizantijski novac iz Narodnog muzeja u Beogradu* (Belgrade: Narodni muzej u Beogradu, 2006); Robert Mihajlovski, “A XIth Century Byzantine Seal from Heraclea near Bitola,” *RĚB* 58 (2000), 273–7; Idem, “A Collection of Medieval Seals from the Fortress Kale in Skopje, Excavated between 2007 and 2012,” *Byzantion* 86 (2016), 261–316; Robert Mihajlovski and Zoran Rujak, “Newly Discovered Byzantine Lead Seals from the Medieval Fortress ‘Carevi Kuli’ in Strumica,” in *Vizantija i slovenite: Srednovjekovni i moderni percepcii i recepcii. Zbornik na trudovi od Pettiot međunaroden simpozium “Denovi na Justinijan I,” Skopje, 17-18.11.2017*, ed. Mitko Panov (Skopje: Univerzitet “Evro-Balkan,” 2018), 137–46.

603 Marko Popović, “Defensive Systems in the Eastern Part of Yugoslavia in the Middle Ages,” *Balkanoslavica* 11–12 (1984–1985), 11–32; Popović and Ivanišević, “Grad Braničevo u srednjem veku”; Ljubomir Maksimović, “Verwaltungsstrukturen in Byzanz und in den Balkanländern,” in *Byzanz und seine Nachbarn*, ed. Armin Hohlweg (Munich: Südosteuropa-Gesellschaft, 1996), 43–63; Predrag Komatina, “Military, Administrative and Religious Strongholds on the Danubian Frontier: The Examples of Morava and Braničevo,” in *Byzantine Heritage and Serbian Art*, vol. 1, *Process of Byzantinization and*

system and urban network of the 10th to 12th centuries is seen as promising in Serbian archaeology.<sup>604</sup>

After the normalization of Hungary’s relations with the Holy Roman Empire during the reign of Grand Prince Géza (who himself may have been baptized in the Latin rite),<sup>605</sup> pilgrims began traveling to the Holy Land through Hungary and further along the Via Militaris. Some of them left records of their journeys through the Balkans, mentioning barbarians, “Scythian bandits” (probably Pechenegs),<sup>606</sup> and Uzes.<sup>607</sup> In the late 1060s, as Hungaro-Byzantine relations worsened, and especially after Byzantium lost control of its territories in Asia Minor, pilgrimage ceased until the First Crusade. Western pilgrims’ testimony about the Balkans has been studied by the Serbian historians Jovanka Kalić, Nenad Fejić, Miloš Antonović, and Aleksandar Uzelac.<sup>608</sup> The latter’s essay “Scythian Brigands in the Bulgarian Desert: A Pilgrim’s View of the Great Morava Valley in the Mid-11th Century” is worth special mention: Uzelac

---

*Serbian Archeology*, ed. Vesna Bikić (Belgrade: The Serbian National Committee of Byzantine Studies, 2016), 103–7; Dragana Spasić-Đurić, “A Note on New Archaeological Explorations in Byzantine Braničevo,” in *Byzantine Heritage and Serbian Art*, 1, 109–15; Bojana Krsmanović, *The Byzantine Province in Change: On the Threshold between the 10th and the 11th Century*.

- 604 Vesna Bikić and Marko Popović, “Arheološke teme u budućim vizantološkim istraživanjima u Srbiji,” in *Vizantijski svet na Balkanu*, vol. 2, eds. Bojana Krsmanović et al. (Belgrade: Vizantološki institut SANU, 2012), 660.
- 605 Nora Berend, József Laszlovszky and Béla Zsolt Szakács, “The Kingdom of Hungary,” in *Christianization and the Rise of Christian Monarchy: Scandinavia, Central Europe and Rus’, c. 900-1200*, ed. Nora Berend (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 329.
- 606 Jovanka Kalić, “Podaci Alberta Ahenskog o ugarsko-vizantijskim odnosima krajem XI veka,” *Zbornik Filozofskog fakulteta* 10 (1968), no. 1, 187.
- 607 *Vita Theoderici, Vita Lietberti, Annales Altahenses*. See: Aleksandar Uzelac, “Zapadnite puteshestvenitsi v ‘Deserta Bulgariae’ predi Pürviya krüstonosen pokhod,” *Epokhi* 25 (2017), no. 1, 197–8.
- 608 Kalić, “Podaci Alberta Ahenskog o ugarsko-vizantijskim odnosima krajem XI veka”; Nenad Fejić, “Les Balkans aux yeux des voyageurs occidentaux au Moyen Age,” in *Actes des congrès de la Société des historiens médiévistes de l’enseignement supérieur public* 26 (1996), 281–9; Miloš Antonović, “Etnička kretanja u Pomoravlju u XI i XII veku,” in *Moravska Srbija – istorija, kultura, umetnost*, ed. Siniša Mišić (Kruševac: Istorijski Arhiv, 2007), 73–84; Uzelac, “Skitski razbojnici u Bugarskoj pustinji. Pogled jednog hodočasnika na Pomoravlje sredinom XI veka”; Idem, “Zapadnite puteshestvenitsi v ‘Deserta Bulgariae’ predi Pürviya krüstonosen pokhod.” Aleksandar Uzelac of the Institute of History, Serbian Academy of Science and Arts, in 2012 defended a doctoral dissertation on “Serbia, Bulgaria, and the Tatars in the Second Half of the 13th Century”: Idem, *Srbija, Bugarska i Tatari u drugoj polovini XIII veka* [Ph.D. thesis] (Belgrade, 2012). In 2015, it was published as a book: Idem, *Pod senkom Psa – Tatari i južnoslovenske zemlje u drugoj polovini XIII veka* (Belgrade: Utopija, 2015). See also: Kristó, *Nichtungarische Völker im mittelalterlichen Ungarn*, 30–3.

concludes that Islam may have been present among the Pechenegs at that time.<sup>609</sup> Finally, Serbian and Croatian historians have also devoted a number of publications to the Cumans.<sup>610</sup>

There is a growing interest in Turkish historiography towards the history of the nomads of the North Pontic steppes. Faruk Sümer (1924–95), who studied the Oghuzes, distinguished between the Pechenegs who lived north of the Black Sea and the “other” Pechenegs – an Oghuz clan (“Peçenek, Oğuz boylarından biri”) that settled in Anatolia in the 10th century and left many toponyms and anthroponyms in Ottoman tax documents and other sources.<sup>611</sup>

In 1972 appeared Akdes Nimet Kurat’s posthumous book on the history of Turkic states and peoples north of the Black Sea, with a chapter on the Pechenegs.<sup>612</sup> Ramazan Şeşen prepared a Turkish edition of Ibn Fadlan and published an overview of Arab geographers’ reports on Turkic peoples.<sup>613</sup> Uli Schamiloglu drew attention to the statement of the Arab historian Ibn Hayyan from Al-Andalus regarding the geographical location of the Pechenegs in the 11th century (?) and to the way the ethnonym itself was spelled.<sup>614</sup> Adnan

609 Uzelac, “Skitski razbojnici u Bugarskoj pustinji. Pogled jednog hodočasnika na Pomoravlje sredinom XI veka,” 62.

610 Dragutin Anastasijević and George Ostrogorsky, “Les Koumanes pronoiaires,” *Annuaire de l’Institut de Philologie et d’Histoire Orientales et Slaves* 11 (1951), 19–29; Živojin Andrejić, “Adoptirana kumanska tradicija u srpskoj umetnosti i usmenoj književnosti kao izvor ‘naučne’ utopije o indijskom porekli Srba i Slovena i mita ‘Srbi narod najstariji,’” *Mitološki zbornik* 29 (2013), 395–436; Mirko Sardelić, “Kumani-Kipčaci između Azije i Europe u razvijenome i kasnome srednjem vijeku,” *Migracijske i etničke teme* 31 (2015), no. 2, 247–74; Đura Hardi, “Cumans and Mongols in the Region of Srem in 1241–1242: a Discussion on the Extent of Devastation,” *Istraživanja* 27 (2016), 84–105; Aleksander Uzelac, “Kumanite v srednovekovna Sürbiya,” *Anamneza* 3 (2008), no. 1, 163–79; Idem, “Konstantinopolis Latin İmparatorluğu’ndaki Kumanlar,” *Oğuz-Türkmen Araştırmaları Dergisi* 3 (2019), no. 1, 268–90.

611 Sümer, *Oğuzlar (Türkmenler): Tarihleri – Boy Teşkilâtı – Destanları*, 320–3. See also his “Bayındır, Peçenek ve Yüreğirler,” *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi* 11 (1953), no. 2–4, 317–44.

612 Akdes N. Kurat, *IV–XVIII. Yüzyıllarda Karadeniz Kuzeyindeki Türk Kavimleri ve Devletleri* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1972), 44–64.

613 Ramazan Şeşen, *İslâm Coğrafyacılarına Göre Türkler ve Türk Ülkeleri* (Ankara: Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü, 1985); *İbn Fadlan Seyahatnamesi*, ed. Ramazan Şeşen (Istanbul: Bedir Yayınları, 1995).

614 Uli Schamiloglu, “The Name of the Pechenegs in Ibn Hayyân’s Al-muqtabas,” *Journal of Turkish Studies (Turks, Hungarians and Kipchaks. A Festschrift in Honor of Tibor Halasi-Kun)* 8 (1984), 216: “... their land [i.e., the land of the Turk = The Hungarians] is in the far east, and the Pechenegs (*Bacanâk*) neighbor them to the east that, the land of *Rûma* is in the direction of the *qibla* [i.e., Mecca] from them, and that the land of Constantinople is a little bit off to the east from them. To their north is the city of Morava

Sadik Erzi (1923–90), a student of Turkish, Arabic, and Persian manuscripts, located in an Arabic-language source dating from 483 AH (1090 AD) a report about a Pecheneg king (*malik*) L.t.k.ā and his son L.n.k.v.ā (or T.ş.k.v.ā) and about Byzantium's (*ar-Rūm*) war against the Pechenegs (*al-Beğenāk*) in the country of the Alans (*fi belde-l-Lān* or *fi beled-u Alān*), which took place in 442 AH (c.1050 AD), during the reign of Emperor Constantine IX Monomachus (*Qunṣanṭīn*).<sup>615</sup>

Specialists in the cultural heritage of the pre-Islamic Turks, such as Emel Esin (1914–87), used Bogomil tombstones from Bosnia and Herzegovina to refute the thesis of Vasilievskiĭ and Obolensky that the Pechenegs (or perhaps Uzes or Cumans) may have brought Manichaeism or the Magi faith from Central Asia to the Balkans. On the other hand, she agreed with Benac's idea that “the funerary monuments reflect ... a Christian faith, and the reminiscences of cosmic concepts observed among medieval Eurasian rider-hunter tribes and their descendants.”<sup>616</sup> The art historian Nejat Diyarbekirli (1928–2017), author of the essential work *Hunnic Art*,<sup>617</sup> studied the treasure of Nagyszentmiklós, concurring with the version of its Pecheneg origin.<sup>618</sup> Osman Karatay of the Ege University of İzmir, is working on the early history of the Proto-Bulgarians, Pechenegs, Hungarians, Uzes, and other tribes that migrated from Asia to Europe in the Middle Ages.<sup>619</sup> Yusuf Ayönü, also of the Ege University, has authored articles on the history of pre-Ottoman Turks in the Balkans and on the service of Turkic mercenaries (including Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans) in the Byzantine army in the 11th and 12th centuries.<sup>620</sup>

Compiling encyclopedic works on the history of the Turkic peoples is a popular pursuit in Turkish historiography. These include the collections

---

(*Marāwa*) and the other cities of the Slavs (*Saqāliba*). To the west of them are the Saxons (*şxşNş*) and the Franks (*Ifranca*).”

- 615 Adnan D. Erzi, “Türkiye Kütüphanelerinden notlar ve vesikalar,” *Türk Tarih Kurumu, Belleten* 14 (1950), 89–90 (quoted after: Stoyanov, *Kumanolojiya: Istoriografski eskizi*, 2, 41–2).
- 616 Emel Esin, “The Conjectural Links of Bogomilism with Central Asian Manicheism,” in *Bogomilstvoto na Balkanot vo svetlinata na najnovite istražuvanja*, eds. Ljuben Lape et al. (Skopje: Makedonska akademija na naukite i umetnostite, 1982), 112.
- 617 Nejat Diyarbekirli, *Hun Sanati* (Istanbul: Milli eğitim basımevi, 1972).
- 618 Idem, “Peçenek hazinesi ve Türk sanatının çeşitli kitalarda gelişen ortak nitelikleri,” *Tarih enstitüsü dergisi* 4–5 (1973–1974), 395–428.
- 619 Osman Karatay, “Etelköz: Ortanca Macar Yurdu Hakkında Yeni Bazı Tespitler,” *Belleten* 78 (2014), no. 281, 41–91; Idem, “Salur Peçenek Savaşları Oğuz Kimliğinin Oluşum Aşamalarını Tespit İçin Bir Deneme,” in 17. *Türk Tarih Kongresi, 15-17 Eylül 2014* (Ankara).
- 620 Yusuf Ayönü, “Bizans Ordusunda Ücretli Türk Askerler (XI–XII. Yüzyıllar),” *Turkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi* 30 (2009), no. 2, 53–69; Idem, “Osmanlı Fetihleri Öncesinde Balkanlarda Türk Varlığı,” *Yeni Türkiye* (2015), 473–82.

*Türkler* (The Turks), *Doğu Avrupa Türk Tarihi* (A History of Turks in Eastern Europe), and *Balkanlar. El Kitabı* (The Balkans: A Guidebook).<sup>621</sup> A number of general overviews of the history of the Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans, including their relations with Byzantium, have been authored by Mualla Uydu Yücel of Istanbul University.<sup>622</sup> Such collections are generally more popular than academic in nature, carry a certain ideological burden (in particular, they are supposed to show the historical continuity of Turkic presence in Europe long before the Ottoman conquest), and suffer from inaccuracies and outright distortions.<sup>623</sup>



Surveying the study of the history of the Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans in the historiographies of the countries of the Balkan-Danubian region, one cannot but notice two contradictory phenomena. On the one hand, these nomads in many respects remain “neglected barbarians.”<sup>624</sup> Perhaps the main reason for this is their situation vis-à-vis, using phenomenological terms, *das Gefragte* – “what one asks for by questioning.”<sup>625</sup> This *das Gefragte* may be “pure” only for those scholars who set out to explore an ancient civilization that has no connection with the present. Early modern and modern historians, having at their disposal medieval written and archaeological sources – what one could call *das Befragte* (“what one interrogates by questioning”) – have been “asking”

621 *Türkler*, 21 vols, eds. Hasan Güzel et al. (Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınlar, 2002); *Doğu Avrupa Türk Tarihi*, eds. Osman Karatay and Serkan Acar (Istanbul: Kitabevi Yayınları, 2013); *Balkanlar. El Kitabı*, vol. 1, *Tarih*, eds. Bilgehan A. Gökdağ and Osman Karatay (Ankara: Vadi Yayınları, 2017).

622 Mualla Yücel, “Balkanlar’da Peçenekler,” in *Türkler*, 2, 714–26; Eadem, “Peçenekler,” in *Doğu Avrupa Türk Tarihi*, 449–528; Eadem, “Uzlar (Oğuzlar),” in *Doğu Avrupa Türk Tarihi*, 529–540; Eadem, “Kumanlar,” in *Doğu Avrupa Türk Tarihi*, 541–56; Eadem, “Balkanlarda Peçenekler, Uzlar ve Kumanlar,” in *Balkanlar. El Kitabı*, vol. 1, *Tarih*, 187–214.

623 Thus, Yonca Anzerlioğlu argues that in 1047 the Pechenegs made a treaty with Constantine Porphyrogenitus (Constantin Porprognennitos in the original): Yonca Anzerlioğlu, “Bizans İmparatorluğu’nda Türk varlığı,” in *Türkler*, vol. 6, 222. The collection *Doğu Avrupa Türk Tarihi* features the Scythians and Sarmatians among the Turkic peoples.

624 I am borrowing this apt term from the title of the following compilation, though it deals with tribal groups of a much earlier era: *Neglected Barbarians*, ed. Florin Curta (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010).

625 The terms are of course Martin Heidegger’s: Martin Heidegger, *Sien und Zeit* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1967), 5–8. [Translator’s remark:] I adopt this particular English translation of *das Gefragte* and *das Befragte* from Jean-Luc Marion, *Reduction and Givenness: Investigations of Husserl, Heidegger, and Phenomenology*, trans. Thomas A. Carlson (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1998), 68.



them first and foremost “for” the history of their own peoples and states. This phenomenon goes beyond the duality of “objectivity” and “subjectivity.”

In some cases, *das Gefragte*, although it had a national direction, did not yet carry the element of an “answer,” which would have resulted in a choice of objects for archaeological study; excavations were carried out in those places where any valuable artifacts had been chanced upon, or ahead of the construction of industrial objects, such as canals, waterworks, gas or oil pipelines, or factories. In other cases, medieval archaeology was interested only in the material record of the bearers of the culture identified with the titular nation (Hungarian or Bulgarian tribes, “Slavs,” “the Romanian population,” and the like), while historians and linguists painstakingly sought out references to said bearers in written sources. Studies of late-nomadic pottery appeared only because it was necessary to distinguish it from the pottery of the “Romanian”/“Bulgarian” population; attention to the role of Turkic nomads in the history of the Balkans in the 11th and 12th centuries became possible in Bulgarian historiography in no small part because there was no Bulgarian state during that period.

On the other hand, for historians from the countries of the Balkan-Danubian region, the events of the 10th and 11th centuries involving nomads are an integral part of their national histories, as are all materials turned up by archaeological excavations, no matter what prompted those excavations in the first place – the construction of the Danube-Black Sea Canal or an interest in the ruins of ancient cities or old capitals of the Bulgarian state. Even though ideological and geopolitical factors have clearly influenced (and continue to influence) the study of the region’s medieval history, the scholarly communities of Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria and other countries of Southeastern Europe do possess a certain quality of *poised perception*; through trial and error, they eventually succeed in finding points of contact between their national histories and the history of Byzantium and its nomadic neighbors.

## Eastern European Historiography since 1945

1. To critically rethink erroneous postulates and conceptions regarding the historical past of Crimea in light of the brilliant work of I.V. Stalin “Marxism and Problems of Linguistics.” To organize work towards the creation of a truly scientific history of Crimea in its inseparable connection with the history of the Russian people.

2. To study carefully and comprehensively relations of the indigenous population with the agricultural population of Eastern Europe in all eras, paying particular attention to ties with the ancient Slavs.

10. To study broadly and comprehensively the history of the infiltration of Slavs and Slavic settlement into Crimea.

12. To resolutely combat the idealization of the Khazars, Pechenegs, Cumans, and Tatars in the history of Crimea.

From the decisions of the so-called Joint Scientific Session of the Section of History and Philosophy at the Crimean Branch of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR<sup>1</sup>



### 1 Soviet and Post-Soviet Archaeology

The territory of the former USSR, with the exception of Crimea and a section of the Lower Danube between the mouth of the Prut and the Chilia branch, lies beyond the area of active contacts between Byzantium and the nomads that inhabited the steppe to the north of the Black Sea. Nevertheless, for a number of reasons, it is still important for us to consider the accomplishments of Soviet archaeology from the 1950s to the early 1990s, as well as the Moldovan, Ukrainian, and Russian archaeological scholarship of the last two decades.

The Pechenegs, Uzes (Oghuzes, Torks), and Cumans (*Polovtsi* in Eastern Slavic usage) left traces of their presence across a wide expanse of land from the Aral Sea to the Alps. The first of these peoples appeared in Europe in the

<sup>1</sup> *Stenogramma ob'yedinennoy nauchnoy sessii Otdeleniya istorii i filosofii Krymskogo filiala Akademii Nauk SSSR po voprosam istorii Kryma* (Simferopol, 1952).

9th century, and the last finally dissolved almost completely within other cultures by the 15th century. The bigger part of their independent existence took place in the lands north of the Black Sea. Accordingly, the largest amount of archaeological material on these medieval nomads is found within the borders of the former USSR, between the Volga and Danube.

From the 1930s on, archaeological research in this vast area progressed quickly: extensive fieldwork was carried out, numerous sites were discovered, and the scholarly community even faced the problem of the “overproduction of sources.”<sup>2</sup> Armed with this considerable body of evidence, Soviet archaeologists were best positioned to address questions of the “cultural attribution” of various artifacts of medieval nomadic life. Romanian, Bulgarian, and Hungarian scholars had to draw on the work of their Soviet colleagues in their own conclusions.

Furthermore, the lands between the Dniester, Prut, and Danube were, so to speak, a gateway from the Eastern world to the Western.<sup>3</sup> In the 10th and 11th centuries, the Dniester-Danube region was not only the arena of a non-stop movement of nomadic tribes, but also a springboard for their raids. The nomads' loot could be the stuff of trade and exchange with the local settled populations.<sup>4</sup> In the opinion of Nicos Oikonomidès, Byzantium also established its presence here, extending its authority to the area between the Danube and Dniester for some time in the late 10th and early 11th century.<sup>5</sup> The Pechenegs' and Cumans' close ties with Crimea do not even require archaeological confirmation – enough was said about them by both Byzantine and Arab authors.

### 1.1 *Interpreting the Archaeological Record of the Late Nomads of the North Pontic Steppe*

*The Cuman Steppe*, a 1948 book by Konstantin Kudryashov (1885–1962),<sup>6</sup> marked a boundary of sorts in the study of medieval nomadic history on the basis of written sources, beyond which it was impossible to produce new

2 *Problemnaya situatsiya v sovremennoy arkheologii*, ed. Vladimir F. Gening (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1988), 66. For instance, Svetlana Pletnyova speaks of more than 2000 excavated burials of the so-called late-medieval nomads – Pechenegs, Uzes-Torks, and Polovtsi (Kipchaks, Cumans) – across the expanse from the Urals through to the Dniester: Svetlana A. Pletnyova, *Kochevniki yuzhnorusskikh stepey v epokhu srednevekov'ya (IV–XIII veka)*, 122.

3 Olga V. Shcherbinina, *Kritika sovremennoy zapadnogermanskoy burzhuaznoy istoriografii istorii Moldavii* (Kishinev: Shtiintsa, 1984), 37.

4 Olena S. Stolyaryk, “Klad monet imperatora Nikifora III Votaniata iz s. Făurești,” in *Arkheologicheskiye issledovaniya*, 138.

5 Oikonomidès, “Recherches sur l'histoire du Bas-Danube aux X–XI siècles,” 71–3.

6 Konstantin V. Kudryashov, *Polovetskaya step'. Ocherki istoricheskoy geografii* (Moscow: OGIz, Geografiz, 1948). Kudryashov defended a doctoral dissertation on “The Northern Black Sea Region in the 9th to 12th Centuries.”

knowledge. The author's conclusions were based mainly on conjectures and his subjective interpretation of various chronicle snippets or *The Tale of Igor's Campaign*. The following year, the Volga-Don Archaeological Expedition (hereafter VDAE) began its work. Turning up a profusion of material remains of different cultures in a compact area, the expedition revived interest in the study of medieval nomads among Soviet archaeologists. It also gave the (probably) final answer to one of the questions posed by Kudryashov: the location of the Khazar fortress of Sarkel.<sup>7</sup>

The expedition was led by Mikhail Artamonov (1898–1972), who specialized in its main subject, the Saltovo-Mayaki culture.<sup>8</sup> Svetlana Pletnyova studied a nomadic kurgan-type burial near the Tsimlyansky site.<sup>9</sup> During 1949–51, more than 10,000 square meters of territory were explored, including three thirds of the Tsimlyansky settlement, surrounding lands, and a huge burial ground. Three volumes of studies and reports were published.<sup>10</sup> Today, the entire site is at the bottom of the Tsimlyansky Reservoir in the Russian Federation.<sup>11</sup>

In 1962, Mikhail Artamonov came out with a wide-ranging study *The History of the Khazars*, summing up three decades of his work.<sup>12</sup> The book was something of an encyclopedia of the history of Eastern Europe in the early Middle Ages. One chapter dealt with the origins and early history of the Magyars and

7 Mikhail I. Artamonov, "Sarkel – Belaya Vezha," in *TVDAE*, 1, 10. Excavations at Sarkel began as early as the 1930s.

8 See: Ivan I. Lyapushkin, "Pamyatniki saltovo-mayatskoy kul'tury v bassejne r. Dona," in *TVDAE*, 1, 85–150.

9 "Introduction," in *TVDAE*, 1, 6.

10 *TVDAE*, 3 vols.

11 Artamonov, "Sarkel – Belaya Vezha," 11. The excavations near the Tsimlyansky site preceded the flooding of the huge territory of the future Tsimlyansky Reservoir, which in turn became part of the Volga – Don Shipping Canal. The idea of this canal had been around for centuries. It was supposed to serve as a monument to the great reign of the Ottoman sultan Selim II and later of the Russian emperor Peter I, but only Stalin succeeded in bringing the project to fruition. See: Sergeĭ V. Bernstein-Kogan, *Volgo-Don. Istoriko-geograficheskiy ocherk* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1954). Interestingly, during the same years the construction of the Danube-Black Sea Canal began in Romania – in the words of A. Madgearu, "a pharaonic work of Stalinist inspiration": Madgearu, "The Dridu Culture and the Changing Position of Romania among the Communist States," 51. In both cases, convict labor was used. On 14 January 1949, a Tsimlyansky Correctional Labor Camp was established. It would hold on average around 47,000 inmates. Groups of inmates (mostly women, around 180 people) worked as auxiliary personnel on the excavations under the direction of Artamonov.

12 Mikhail I. Artamonov, *Istoriya khazar* (Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Gosudarstvennogo Ermitazha, 1962); Svetlana A. Pletnyova, "[Review of:] M.I. Artamonov, *Istoriya khazar*," *SovArkh* (1964), no. 3, 279–83; Golden, "Khazar Studies: Achievements and Perspectives," 31–5.

Pechenegs. As Svetlana Pletnyova noted, however, Artamonov used archaeological data primarily for illustration purposes, still relying mostly on written sources.<sup>13</sup>

Works by other members of the expedition, including the archaeologist Svetlana Pletnyova,<sup>14</sup> turkologist Alexandr Shcherbak (see below),<sup>15</sup> and paleoanthropologists Wulf Ginsburg<sup>16</sup> and Lidiya Vuitch,<sup>17</sup> were engaged more consistently with archaeological materials. The last two of these scholars laid the foundation for the anthropological study of the medieval nomads of the Western Eurasian steppes.

The influence of the VDAE's results on the study of Pecheneg and Tork archaeological materials was not confined to specialized articles and reports. The original limited goal of the expedition was to save from the imminent flooding at least part of the Tsimlyansky site, suspected to be the fortress of Sarkel figuring in written sources. However, the project not only advanced the general knowledge of the so-called Saltovo-Mayaki culture that scholars associated with the population of the Khazar Khaganate, but also stimulated a wider interest in early medieval archaeology in general. The Tsimlyansky site was unique from the archaeological standpoint, because historians knew the dates of its founding (the 830s AD) and destruction (965 AD), as well as the ethnic makeup of its population and the groups that, based on the testimony of the written sources, may have been involved in its life, such as the Khazars, Alans, Bulgars, Pechenegs, and Oghuzes, among others. Furthermore, the necropolis discovered near the settlement was the largest permanent nomadic burial ground from that period found in the Eurasian steppes – in the 1930s, it comprised over 100 kurgans.<sup>18</sup>

- 
- 13 Svetlana A. Pletnyova, *Ot kocheviy k gorodam. Saltovo-mayatskaya kul'tura* (Moscow: Nauka, 1967), 10. Artamonov also attempted a reinterpretation of the *Toparcha Gothicus* (Mikhail I. Artamonov, "O tak nazyvayemoy zapiske got'skogo ili grecheskogo toparkha," *Vestnik Leningradskogo universiteta* 20 (1970), no. 4 ("Istoriya. Yazyk. Literatura"), 75–81), but it was not a success: Bozhilov, "Anonimüt na Khaze," 17.
- 14 Svetlana A. Pletnyova, "Keramika Sarkela – Beloy Vezhi," in *TVDAE*, 2, 212–72; Eadem, "Kochevnicheskiy mogil'nik bliz Sarkela – Beloy Vezhi," in *TVDAE*, 3, 216–59; Eadem, "Pechenegi, torki, polovtsy v yuzhnorusskikh stepyakh," in *TVDAE*, 1, 151–226.
- 15 Alexandr M. Shcherbak, "Znaki na keramike i kirpichakh iz Sarkela – Beloy Vezhi (K voprosu o yazyke i pis'mennosti pechenegov)," in *TVDAE*, 2, 362–89.
- 16 Wulf V. Ginsburg, "Antropologicheskiy sostav naseleniya Sarkela – Beloy Vezhi i yego proiskhozhdeniye," in *TVDAE*, 3, 261–81.
- 17 Lidiya G. Vuitch, "Antropologicheskaya kharakteristika cherepov iz rannikh pogrebeniy Sarkela," in *TVDAE*, 3, 282–94; Eadem, "Cherepa iz kochevnicheskogo mogil'nika vnzle Sarkela – Beloy Vezhi," in *TVDAE*, 3, 420–45.
- 18 Pletnyova, *Kochevniki yuzhnorusskikh stepy v epokhu srednevekov'ya (IV–XIII veka)*, 124–5.

The discussion between Artamonov and his student Ivan Lyapushkin (1902–68) regarding the ethnic attribution of artifacts of the Saltovo-Mayaki culture<sup>19</sup> attracted the attention of the broader academic community.<sup>20</sup> The VDAE's success inspired Lev Gumilyov to embark on a search for the Khazar capital in 1959–61. One outcome of this search was the discovery of sea-level fluctuations in the Caspian Sea,<sup>21</sup> which led Gumilyov to conclude that there was a correlation between climate change (fluctuations in the humidity of the steppe) and nomadic migrations.<sup>22</sup> Preliminary explorations by Georgii Fyodorov (1917–93) in Moldavia revealed a resemblance between the newly-discovered materials and artifacts of the Saltovo-Mayaki culture.<sup>23</sup> This fact influenced discussions among Bulgarian, Romanian, and Moldavian scholars concerning the so-called Balkan-Danubian culture.<sup>24</sup>

- 
- 19 See: Artamonov, "Sarkel – Belaya Vezha," 7–84; Olga A. Artamonova[-Poltavtseva], "Mogil'nik Sarkela – Beloy Vezhi," in *TVDAE*, 3, 9–215; Ivan I. Lyapushkin, "Arkheologicheskiye pamyatniki zony zatopeniya Tsimlyanskogo vodokhranilishcha (Po materialam Razvedochnogo otryada Volgo-Donskoy arkheologicheskoy ekspeditsii Instituta istorii material'noy kul'tury AN SSSR 1950-1951 gg.)," in *TVDAE*, 1, 227–62; Idem, "Pamyatniki saltovo-mayatskoy kul'tury v bassejne r. Dona," 85–150.
- 20 Pletnyova, *Ot kocheviy k gorodam. Saltovo-mayatskaya kul'tura*, 5–7.
- 21 Anatolii G. Aleksin and Lev N. Gumilyov, "Khazarskaya Atlantida," *Aziya i Afrika segodnya* (1962), no. 2, 52–3; Lev N. Gumilyov, "Heterochronism in the Moisture Supply of Eurasia in the Middle Ages (Landscape Ethnos, V)," *Soviet Geography* (1968), no. 9, 23–35.
- 22 See also: Oleksii V. Komar, "Kutrigury i utigury v Severnom Prichernomor'ye," in *Sugdeyskiy sbornik* 1, eds. Nelya M. Kukoval's'ka et al. (Kyiv/Sudak: Akadempriodyka, 2003), 197; Atanasov, *Dobrudzhanskoto despotstvo*, 15. The most recent analysis at the Institute of Physiochemical and Biological Problems of Soil Science detected significant fluctuations in the precipitation levels in the historical era across the Volga-Don steppes during the Eneolith, Bronze, Early Iron, and Middle Ages (fourth millennium BC–14th century AD). For example, during the Early Sarmathian period, the average annual atmospheric precipitation was approximately 400 mm; during the 8th to 11th centuries AD – 300–350 mm, and in the era of the Golden Horde – 420–450 mm (See: Vitalii A. Demkin, *Volgo-Donskiye stepi v drevnosti i srednevekov'ye (po materialam pochvenno-arkheologicheskikh issledovaniy)* (Pushchino: Synchronobook, 2010), 94).
- 23 Pletnyova, *Ot kocheviy k gorodam. Saltovo-mayatskaya kul'tura*, 8.
- 24 See: Georgii B. Fyodorov, Vera M. Negruşa, "Slavyane i balkano-dunayskaya arkheologicheskaya kul'tura," in *Kompleksnyye problemy istorii i kul'tury narodov Tsentral'noy i Yugo-Vostochnoy Yevropy. Itogi i perspektivy issledovaniy*, eds. Vladimir K. Volkov et al. (Moscow: Nauka, 1979), 53–5; Georgii F. Chebotarenko, "Balkano-dunayskaya arkheologicheskaya kul'tura v zarubezhnoy istoriografii," in *Slavyano-moldavskiy svyazi i ranniye etapy etnicheskoy istorii moldavan*, ed. Valentin S. Zelenchuk (Kishinev: Shtiintsa, 1983), 58–79; Madgearu, "The Dridu Culture and the Changing Position of Romania among the Communist States," 53.

One of the most significant achievements connected with the VDAE was the systematic study of Pecheneg and Oghuz burials by Svetlana Pletnyova (1926–2008).<sup>25</sup> It stimulated her further research in this field. After two years of intensive work on the expedition, Pletnyova defended a Candidate's thesis<sup>26</sup> on "The Nomads of the South-Russian Steppe from the 9th to the 13th Centuries (in Light of Archaeological Materials and Written Sources)" in 1952.<sup>27</sup> In 1968, she completed her doctoral thesis, "From Camps to Towns."<sup>28</sup>

Based on the study of all archaeological data relating to the medieval nomads of the North Pontic steppe available at that time (333 kurgan complexes), Pletnyova divided these materials into 5 groups. She proposed a very wide range of markers for determining the ethnicity of a burial. Among the "Pecheneg" attributes (group I, 48 burial complexes), she listed the western orientation of the body, the interment of horse parts without a human body and of horse parts next to the human body, as well as the presence of horse bits without bends.<sup>29</sup> The placement of the body with its head to the east, the interment of a whole horse with the body, and separate pits for horse burials were classified by Pletnyova as "Cuman" attributes (group IV, 72 burials).<sup>30</sup> As for "Tork" burials (group II, three complexes), in her view, they differed from "Pecheneg" ones only in detail, particularly in various complications in the construction of the grave pits themselves, such as overlays, fill-ups, and the like.<sup>31</sup>

The largest group of burials (group III, more than 150 complexes), according to Pletnyova, could be attributed to two nomadic confederacies: the

25 On Svetlana Pletnyova, see: "Tvorcheskii put' Svetlany Aleksandrovny Pletnovoy," in *Stepi Vostochnoy Yevropy v sredniye veka. Sbornik pamyati Svetlany Aleksandrovny Pletnovoy*, 11–36. Bibliography: *Ibid.*, 37–59.

26 On the Soviet system of academic degrees, see: Seymour Michael Rosen, *Education and Modernization in the USSR* (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co., 1971), 92–3.

27 The dissertation became the basis for "Pechenegi, torki, polovtsy v yuzhnorusskikh stepyakh."

28 Pletnyova, *Ot kocheviy k gorodam. Saltovo-mayatskaya kul'tura*.

29 Eadem, "Pechenegi, torki, polovtsy v yuzhnorusskikh stepyakh," 153–61. Ukrainian scholar Oleh Dubynets has analyzed 78 nomadic burials of the 10th and 11th centuries containing snaffle-bits with single mouthpieces and argued that these snaffle-bits cannot be definitively seen as Pecheneg: Oleh V. Dubynets, "K voprosu o kul'turnoy interpretatsii odno-sostavnykh udil v kochevnicheskikh pogrebeniyakh X–XI vv. vostochnoyevropeyskoy stepi," *Zhurnal istoricheskikh, politologicheskikh i mezhdunarodnykh issledovaniy* (2013), no. 1, 67–72.

30 Pletnyova, "Pechenegi, torki, polovtsy v yuzhnorusskikh stepyakh," 172–82.

31 *Ibid.*, 161–5.

Tork-Oghuz alliance and the Black Hoods (Qaraqalpaq).<sup>32</sup> Pechenegs constituted the largest part of the latter, and thus its burial ritual differed little from that of group I. The archaeologist separated into a special category (group V, 40 complexes) burials of the conquered and Turkified population of the Donets steppe, which she saw as Slavic and Christian.<sup>33</sup>

In 1948, an alternative system of identifying Tork burials was proposed by Nonna Metz.<sup>34</sup> In 1952, around the same time as Pletnyova, Leonid Zyablin (1914–82) defended his thesis on “The Archaeological Remains of Nomads in Eastern Europe, 10th to 14th Centuries.”<sup>35</sup> Both scholars faced the problem of correlating archaeological findings with nomadic ethnic groups known to us from the written sources. Zyablin proposed to identify nomadic burials that included horse parts as Pecheneg, those containing whole horses as Tork, and the rest as belonging to the Polovtsi.<sup>36</sup> Despite such differences of opinion concerning the selection of ethnic markers for nomadic burials, all three researchers took for granted Alexandr Spitsyn’s hypothesis that the burial rite of each nomadic people mentioned in the *Primary Chronicle* (according to Spitsyn – the Pechenegs, Torks-Uzes, and Berendei) had its own distinguishing traits. This hypothesis remains prevalent in Russian historiography to this day.

On the subject of Byzantine-nomadic relations, Pletnyova followed Vasilievskii’s “Byzantium and the Pechenegs.” Moreover, drawing on Vasilievskii’s idea about the overall homogeneity of the Pechenegs, Torks-Uzes, Polovtsi, and Seljuks, which transcended tribal distinctions, she argued that the goal of the Danubian Uzes was to conquer Byzantium.<sup>37</sup>

The system for the ethnic attribution of nomadic burials proposed by Pletnyova never quite took root in Soviet archaeology. So, for instance, Lyudmila

32 Peter Golden argues that the “Black Hoods” were not a separate people, but rather “consisted of remnants of the Ouz/Torks, the Pečenegs and lesser groups such as the Berendei, Kui/ Kovui, Turpei, and Kaepiči (*Qay-opa/oba*):” Peter B. Golden, “The Polovci Dikii,” *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 3/4, 1979, 296.

33 Pletnyova, “Pechenegi, torki, polovtsy v yuzhnorusskikh stepyakh,” 182–6.

34 Nonna D. Metz, “K voprosu o torkakh,” in *Kratkiye soobshcheniya Instituta istorii material’noy kul’tury* 23 (1948), 45–9. About Nonna Metz, see: Alla S. Mel’nikova, “Vspominaya Nonnu Dmitriyevnu Mets (15.9.1923–20.1.1965),” *Numizmaticheskii al’manakh* (2000), no. 4, 4–9. See also: Maxym V. Kvitnyts’kyi, “Torky. Problema atrybutsiyi pokhoval’nykh kompleksiv,” *Arkheolohiya* (2004), no. 4, 25–34.

35 Leonid P. Zyablin, *Arkheologicheskiye pamyatniki kochevnikov X–XIV vv. Vostochnoy Yevropy* [Candidate’s thesis] (Moscow, 1952); Idem, “O ‘tatarskikh’ kurganakh,” *SovArkH* 22 (1955) 83–96.

36 Andrii O. Dobrolyubskii, *Kochevniki Severo-Zapadnogo Prichernomor’ya v epokhu srednevekov’ya*, 18–9.

37 Pletnyova, “Pechenegi, torki, polovtsy v yuzhnorusskikh stepyakh,” 165.



Kukhareva, describing a newly-discovered cemetery near Maksimovka, complained about the absence of a clear set of criteria that would help connect it to a specific ethnic group.<sup>38</sup>

Most of Pletnyova's more than a hundred articles and books were dedicated to the North Pontic steppes in the 9th to 13th centuries. Among these works, some were narrowly archaeological, some historical-archaeological, and some synthetic, addressing the social and political life of nomads, drawing on the theory of nomadism, and employing a wide variety of sources.

"From Camps to Towns" showcases this synthetic tendency in Pletnyova's work very well. The study's main idea is that sedentarization was a necessary stage in the development of nomadic society. In Pletnyova's view, insofar as camp nomadism (*tabornoe kočevanie*) was central to the life of the Pechenegs and Torks in the 9th to 11th centuries, they could not create a culture of their own.<sup>39</sup>

This scheme was not new in Soviet historiography and it harmonized well with the Marxist teaching about base and superstructure. Creating insufficient *surplus value*, nomads supposedly were not able to develop class societies and therefore the state, although Fyodorov-Davydov, for instance, did believe that there were signs of the emergence of an early feudal state among the Pechenegs in the 11th century through the social differentiation of nomadic society, evident in the contents of burials.<sup>40</sup> In recent studies, including those of Pletnyova, we may observe a departure from the "class analysis" of burial inventories.<sup>41</sup>

Pletnyova's *Nomads of the Middle Ages: The Search for Historical Patterns* (1982) synthesized the entirety of the accomplishments of Soviet medieval

38 Lyudmila S. Kukhareva, "Mohl'nyk kochevnykov u sela Maksymovka na Dnepre," in *Issledovaniya po arkheologii SSSR. Sbornik statey v chest' prof. M.I. Artamonova*, ed. Victor F. Gaydukevich (Leningrad: Leningradskiy gosudarstvennyy universitet, 1961), 201.

39 Pletnyova, *Ot kocheviy k gorodam. Saltovo-mayatskaya kul'tura*, 180–2. See also: Peter B. Golden, "Khazar Studies: Achievements and Perspectives," 35–6.

40 Fyodorov-Davydov, *Kochevniki Vostochnoy Yevropy*, 219–20.

41 See: Ekaterina A. Armarchuk, "O zhurnale 'Tatarskaya arkheologiya,'" *RosArkh* (2001), no. 1, 133–4; Heinrich Härke and Sergeï N. Savenko, "Problemy issledovaniya drevnikh pogrebeniy v zapadnoyevropeyskoy arkheologii," *RosArkh* (2000), no. 1, 224; Svetlana A. Pletnyova, "Vozmozhnosti vyyavleniya sotsial'no-ekonomicheskikh kategoriy po materialam pogrebal'noy obryadnosti," *RosArkh* (1993), no. 4, 160–72. However, some artifacts from nomadic burials may indeed indicate the social status of the deceased: Victor Chkhaidze, "Kostyanye navershiya pletey s otrostkom v pogrebeniyakh srednevekovykh kochevnikov vostochnoyevropeyskikh stepey," in *Stepi Vostochnoy Yevropy v sredniye veka. Sbornik pamyati Svetlany Aleksandrovny Pletnovoy*, 353–82.

archaeology and theory of nomadism.<sup>42</sup> The influence of Gumilyov's works comes through clearly in Pletnyova's arguments. She modifies her view of the Pechenegs in the era of their incursions into Byzantium. According to Pletnyova, in the mid-10th century the Pechenegs were already moving toward the second stage of nomadism, but after clashing with the Polovtsi they were forced to seek new pastures or the protection of powerful neighbors. Their clash with Byzantium was supposed to win them new pasturelands, but ended in a military defeat that turned the remnants of the Pecheneg tribes into the empire's vassals.

In 1976–81, Pletnyova chaired the editorial board of the historical-archaeological project *The Steppes of Eurasia in the Middle Ages*,<sup>43</sup> which has not lost its scholarly significance to this day. The project encompassed the entire range of Soviet archaeology's advances in the study of medieval nomads. It offered valuable graphic representations of the main groups of artifacts from Pecheneg, Oghuz, and Polovtsian graves, pottery, and types of burials. The contributors mapped out the geography of nomadic finds and gave a concise chronological and historical overview of medieval nomadic burials and artifacts they contained.

In 1991, Pletnyova published an article on "Relations between Eastern European Nomads and Byzantium in Light of Archaeological Sources," in which she argued that Byzantium had little impact on the lifestyle and material culture of the neighboring nomads, including the Pechenegs, but that the reverse influence was more noticeable, both in clothes and in military matters. She considered the influence of Byzantine gifts on the social development of nomadic peoples. The scarcity or even absence of "Byzantine" objects in the nomadic burials of the 10th to the first half of the 12th centuries characterized "the first stage of nomadism," when families did not accumulate luxury goods and did not pass them down from generation to generation.<sup>44</sup>

German Fyodorov-Davydov (1931–2000), a Russian archaeologist and numismatist specializing in the history of the Golden Horde, drew attention to the shortcomings of Pletnyova's system. In the early 1960s, Fyodorov-Davydov began work on a doctoral thesis, "The Nomads of Eastern Europe, 10th to 14th Centuries," which he defended in 1966 and eventually published as two

42 Svetlana A. Pletnyova, *Kochevniki Srednevekov'ya. Poisk istoricheskikh zakonomernostey* (Moscow: Nauka, 1982).

43 *Stepi Yevrazii v epokhu srednevekov'ya*. See also Petre Diaconu's review: Petre Diaconu in *RdI* (1981), no. 9, 1747–53.

44 Svetlana A. Pletnyova, "Otnosheniya vostochnoyevropeyskikh kochevnikov s Vizantiyey i arkhologicheskoye istochniki," *SovArk* (1991), no. 3, 100.

monographs.<sup>45</sup> In the first of these, Fyodorov-Davydov criticized all previous attempts at ethnic attribution of nomadic materials. Among the major flaws plaguing such efforts, he listed the lack of chronological classification of artifacts, the idea that a certain kind of burial rite is invariably attached to a certain ethnic group, the use of certain generic types of artifacts widely spread across the steppes for ethnic attribution, and the reliance on specific forms of funeral rites for dating burial complexes despite the absence of artifacts of the so-called dating types.<sup>46</sup>

Instead, Fyodorov-Davydov proposed to single out special “dating” types of artifacts and burials, as an alternative to dating based on analogy. Drawing on materials from over a thousand nomadic burial complexes from the 10th to the 14th century, he described in detail all types of inventory found in them, as well as the burials themselves (both graves and skeletons), using a much larger number of formal characteristics than usual. Fyodorov-Davydov sorted all artifacts according to three degrees of classification: categories based on functional characteristics; groups and sections based on materials and techniques employed; and types based on the form and shape of objects. Mathematical and statistical methods were used to process information about artifacts and burials. Fyodorov-Davydov also outlined the geographical distribution of different groups of artifacts.<sup>47</sup>

As the Ukrainian archaeologist Andriï Dobrolyubskii notes, since the publication of Fyodorov-Davydov’s book *The Nomads of Eastern Europe under the Rule of the Khans of the Golden Horde*, no serious doubts have been voiced as to the soundness of the methods he developed and the reliability of the results he achieved.<sup>48</sup> Pletnyova observed that the book marked a significant progress in the study of this subject.<sup>49</sup> Researchers working in this field still rely heavily on the methodology devised by Fyodorov-Davydov.<sup>50</sup>

45 Fyodorov-Davydov, *Kochevniki Vostochnoy Yevropy*.

46 *Ibid.*, 8.

47 *Ibid.*, 9–11; German A. Fyodorov-Davydov, “On the Dating of Types of Artifacts From Burial Assemblages,” *Soviet Anthropology and Archaeology* 5 (1966), no. 2, 22–34.

48 Dobrolyubskii, *Kochevniki Severo-Zapadnogo Prichernomor’ya v epokhu srednevekov’ya*, 21.

49 Pletnyova, *Drevnosti chernykh klobukov*, 20.

50 Vladimir A. Ivanov, “Pogrebal’nyy obryad srednevekovykh kochevnikov yevropeysko-aziatskogo pogranič’ya kak etnomarkiruyushchiy priznak i svyazuyushcheye zveno v kul’turogeneze srednevekovykh kochevnikov Vostochnoy Yevropy,” in Vladimir A. Ivanov, Gennadii N. Garustovich and Yaroslav V. Pylypchuk, *Srednevekovyye kochevniki na granitse Yevropy i Azii* (Ufa: Bashkirskiy gosudarstvennyy pedagogicheskiy universitet im. M. Akmully, 2014), 136; Ioniță, “Observații asupra mormintelor,” 135.

The main problem with Fyodorov-Davydov's book was not its methodology but its limited source base.<sup>51</sup> Thus, based on the archaeological data available at the time for charting the geography of Pecheneg migrations, he doubted any significant presence of these nomads west of the Dnieper.<sup>52</sup> Nearly the only reason for this was that a huge number of medieval nomadic sites in southern Ukraine and Moldova known today still remained undiscovered at the time. Unfortunately, after 1966 Fyodorov-Davydov never seriously revisited the problem of the pre-Golden-Horde nomads.

The accumulation of new archaeological data from burials belonging to Eurasia's medieval nomads over the last three or four decades has led to the appearance of a number of qualifications and additions to the earlier schemes of their attribution. Scholars working with materials excavated east of the Don have been especially active in this regard,<sup>53</sup> even though a number of

51 Ivanov believes that Fyodorov-Davydov even failed to make use of all the evidence available at that time, at least from the Volga region: Ivanov, "Pogrebal'nyy obryad srednevekovykh kochevnikov," 110. For a comprehensive history of the study of the nomadic archaeological record in the Volga-Urals region, see: Gennadii N. Garustovich, "Istoriya izucheniya pamyatnikov srednevekovykh kochevnikov v Yuzhnom Priural'ye, Zapadnom Kazakhstane i Zavolzh'ye," in *Srednevekovyye kochevniki na granitse Yevropy i Azii*, 24–117.

52 Fyodorov-Davydov, *Kochevniki Vostochnoy Yevropy*, 141.

53 Svetlana Pletnyova observed that the mass discovery of new burials in the 20th century, and especially in its last few decades, was due to the rapid spread of land cultivation and hasty excavation of kurgans in the Eastern European steppes. (Pletnyova, *Kochevniki yuzhnorusskikh stepey v epokhu srednevekov'ya (IV–XIII veka)*, 127). As of 2014, 787 burials of the so-called late nomads (10th to 14th centuries) had been studied across the steppes of the trans-Volga region and near the Southern Urals. 18.3 percent of them are attributed to the Pechenegs and Oghuzes: Vladimir A. Ivanov, "Istoricheskaya retrospektsiya Uralo-Povolzhskoy stepi: landshaftno-klimaticheskaya i etnokul'turnaya dinamika," in *Srednevekovyye kochevniki na granitse Yevropy i Azii*, 21. Almost all of them are located in the *sirt* steppes near the Urals (*sirt* is the Turkic for "hill") and the steppes of the Lower Volga, which Ivanov explains by the relative aridity of the other parts of the steppe during that period (*Ibid.*, 22). Overall, 314 such burials have been discovered between the Don and the Ural Mountains: V.A. Ivanov, "Pogrebal'nyy obryad srednevekovykh kochevnikov," 131–2. Yevgeniya Schnaidstein singles out 71 Pecheneg-Oghuz burials on the Lower Volga, without differentiating between the Oghuz and Pecheneg ones (Yevgeniya V. Schnaidstein, "Pechenezhskiy pamyatniki Nizhnego Povolzh'ya," in *Istoricheskaya etnografiya: mezhrusskiy sbornik. (Problemy arkheologii i etnografii. Issue 3)*, ed. Rudolf F. Its (Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, 1985), 84. Across the steppes north of the Caucasus (the Terek – Kuma lowlands, Kuban lowlands, and Stavropol uplands), 60 kurgan cemeteries and individual burials in kurgans are known, as well as 110 stone sculptures attributed to the nomads of the 11th to 14th centuries: Victor N. Chkhaidze "Kochevniki XI–XIV vv. v stepnom Predkavkaz'ye: voprosy terminologii i etnicheskoy prinadlezhnosti," in *Pyataya Kubanskaya arkheologicheskaya*

Pecheneg burials were excavated in the last quarter of the 20th century west of that river as well.<sup>54</sup>

Based on his analysis of 110 graves, Andreï Atavin (1954–2004) distinguishes three types of horse burials. The first involves the legs being severed up to the first joint, or only the head being present in the grave. In the second type, the legs are severed up to the pastern or metacarpi and placed parallel to each other. These types correspond to the burials of the 10th and 11th centuries and can be attributed to the Pechenegs or Uzes.<sup>55</sup> Irina Matyushko concludes that Pecheneg burials of the 9th to 11th centuries in the vicinity of the Urals are characterized by the placement of the horse parts left of the human remains and on the same level with them; Oghuz burials can be identified by the placement of the horse parts on a special overlay above the human remains; and Cuman and Kimek ones by the placement of the horse parts on an earthen step left of the human remains. 9th to 11th-century burials have earth mounds over them, while stones are used in later kurgans.<sup>56</sup> Pavel Popov, summing up a number of studies of Pecheneg and Oghuz burials along the Volga, states that Pecheneg burials have no ethnic markers at all.<sup>57</sup>

Based on a study of 211 kurgans, mostly from the area west of the Volga and east of the Southern Urals, Vladimir Ivanov and Vladimir Krieger significantly expand the list of characteristics for statistical analysis of nomadic burial rituals.<sup>58</sup> Gennadiï Garustovich (1957–2017), Vladimir Ivanov, Vladimir

---

*konferentsiya. Materialy konferentsii*, eds. Ivan I. Marchenko et al. (Krasnodar, 2009), 419. See also: Yevgenii I. Narozhnyi, *Srednevekovyye kochevniki Severnogo Kavkaza* (Armavir: Armavirskoye poligrafpredpriyatiye, 2005); Inga A. Druzhynina, Victor N. Chkhaidze and Yevgenii I. Narozhnyi, *Srednevekovyye kochevniki v vostochnom Priazov'ye* (Armavir/Moscow: Slavyanka, 2011); Arman A. Bisembaev, *Arkheologicheskiy pamyatniki kochevnikov srednevekov'ya Zapadnogo Kazakhstana VIII-XVIII vv.* (Oral: Zapadno-Kazakhstanskiy oblastnoy tsentr istorii i arkheologii, 2003).

54 Volodymyr M. Shalabudov, "Neopublikovannyye kochevnicheskyye pogrebeniya, otkrytyye novostroyechnymi ekspeditsiyami DGU v 1972-1999 gg.," in *Problemy arkheolohiyi Podniprov'ya. Naukovyy mizhvuziv's'kyy zbirnyk z problem arkheolohiyi ta davn'oyi istoriyi*, ed. Iryna F. Kovalyova (Dnipropetrovsk: Dnipropetrovskyy natsional'nyy universytet imeni Olesya Honchara, 2012), 86–106.

55 Andreï G. Atavin "Nekotoryye osobennosti zakhroneniya chuchel koney v kochevnicheskikh pogrebeniyakh X-XIV vv.," *SovArkh* (1984), no. 1, 137.

56 Irina V. Matyushko, *Pogrebal'nyy obryad kochevnikov stepy Priural'ya v IX-XIV vv.* (Orenburg: Universitet, 2015), 24–5.

57 Pavel V. Popov, "K voprosu ob etnokul'turnykh sostavlyayushchikh material'noy kul'tury oguzov i pechenegov," *Stepi Yevropy v epokhu srednevekov'ya* 9 (2012), 405.

58 Vladimir A. Ivanov and Vladimir A. Krieger, *Kurgany kypchakskogo vremeni na Yuzhnom Urals (XII-XIV vv.)* (Moscow: Nauka, 1988), 81–90. See also: Vladimir A. Krieger, *Kochevniki Zapadnogo Kazakhstana i sopredel'nykh territoriy v sredniye veka (X-XIV vv.)* (Oral: Yevraziyskiy soyuz uchenykh, 2012).

Krieger, and Yevgeniï Kruglov consider the problem of telling burials of Pechenegs and Uzes apart from the general mass of “late nomadic” burials.<sup>59</sup> At the same time, Ivanov notes that the analysis of burial data does not bear out Pletnyova’s hypothesis about ethnic and cultural kinship between the Oghuzes, Pechenegs, and Cumans.<sup>60</sup>

Garustovich and Ivanov attempt to distinguish between Oghuz and Pecheneg burials. In their view, the Pecheneg dead were interred in simple graves, extended in the supine position, head to the west, sometimes in a plank coffin, with a horse hide in the bottom of the grave pit and left of the human remains, the horse harnessed and saddled (but its bones and hide on the level with the human remains). They argue that Pecheneg graves frequently contain sheep bones. Horse harness found in the burials includes rigid mouthpieces<sup>61</sup>

59 Gennadiï N. Garustovich and Vladimir A. Ivanov, *Oguzy i pechenegi v Yevraziyskikh stepyakh* (Ufa: Gilem, 2001); Yevgeniï V. Kruglov, “Pogrebal’nyy obryad oguzov Severnogo Prikaspiya 2-y pol. IX–1-y pol. XI v.,” *Stepi Yevropy v epokhu srednevekov’ya* 2 (2001), 395–446; Idem, “Pechenegi i oguzy: nekotoryye problemy arkhologicheskikh istochnikov,” *Stepi Yevropy v epokhu srednevekov’ya* 3 (2003), 13–83.

60 Ivanov, “Pogrebal’nyy obryad srednevekovykh kochevnikov,” 150. Overall, the researchers list the following traits marking burials of the so-called Turk-Pecheneg period: interment under earthen kurgans (94 percent) and mostly inlet burials in earlier mounds (74.2 percent); usually one body per grave, but sometimes two (11.9 percent); simple graves (60.4 percent), with more than a quarter of the known graves overlaid with blocks of wood embedded in the filling of the pit (26.4 percent); horse burials are represented by skulls, leg bones, and hides placed left of the human remains or above them (in the filling of the grave or on a wooden platform (20.8 and 30.8 percent respectively)); a number of burials are horseless but contain horse harness (6.9 percent). Most graves are oriented to the west (west – 42.8 percent, north-west – 9.8 percent, south-west – 35.2 percent); the placement of the body in a plank coffin or on a wooden platform is frequent (10.7 and 17 percent). The funeral fare is most often represented by sheep bones (17.6 percent). The most frequently found grave goods are: stirrups and bits (39 and 33.3 percent); weapons – iron arrowheads (40.9 percent), bone onlays for bows (22 percent), and sabers (11.9 percent); personal adornments – belt buckles and onlays (48.4 percent), pendant earrings, mostly in the form of rings (10 percent), bird-shaped pendants and earpick pendants (14.4 percent); household objects – knives (31.4 percent) and steels and flints (11.3 percent). 7.5 percent of all graves do not contain any grave goods. Ibid., pp. 123–125. According to Ivanov, the Cuman-Kipchak burials are characterized by earth mounds (the majority of burials, 84.6 percent) and stone structures (10.6 percent, found west of the Volga, mainly in Ukraine), shaft-and-chamber graves, and the placement of a horse hide (or skull and leg bones) on an overlay above or near the human remains: Vladimir A. Ivanov, “Plemena konfederatsii kipchakov/polovtsev v Vostochnoy Yevrope po dannym pis’mennykh istochnikov i arkheologii,” in *Tyurkologicheskiy sbornik, 2013-2014: Pamyati Sergeya Grigor’evicha Klyashtornogo*, eds. Tatyana D. Skrynnikova et al. (Moscow: Nauka, 2016), 94–103.

61 Pletnyova notes that bits with similar mouthpieces are used today for training young horses: Pletnyova, *Kochevniki yuzhnorusskikh stepey v epokhu srednevekov’ya (IV–XIII veka)*, 125. See also: Petkes, “Rúdzahlák a 10–12. századi Kárpát-medencében,” 231–46.

and stirrups of various types. Weapons are decorated with slitted bells. Bows with bone onlays in the middle part are common in such graves, as are belts with triangular frame buckles or rectangular or lyre-like buckles, and hand-fashioned jugs or flat-bottomed pots. Oghuz burials are richer,<sup>62</sup> with simple rectangular inlet graves, sometimes overlaid with wood, with the body extended in the supine position, head to the west. The horse head is richly decorated, the horse hide with a saddle and harness is placed on an overlay above the human remains. Graves often produce rectangular girth buckles, belts with oval cast frame buckles and ornamented tips, bird-shaped pendants and earpicks,<sup>63</sup> decorative disks, and finger rings of the so-called Saltov type.<sup>64</sup>

The main written source for the idea that the burial rituals of the Oghuzes and Pechenegs were different from each other is the testimony of Ibn Fadlan. He wrote that the Oghuzes covered graves with planks and then clay, placed the head, tail, and legs of a horse into the grave, and pulled a hide over it,<sup>65</sup> surmising that Pecheneg graves had no external structures or markings.<sup>66</sup>

Scholars disagree about the dating of the Pechenegs' presence in the Volga-Don region. For instance, Yevgeniï Kruglov believes that the North Caspian steppes in the second half of the 9th to the first half of the 11th centuries were occupied by the Oghuzes, not the Pechenegs, while the latter began

62 Pletnyova also believes that Oghuz graves are richer and relates this to the more important role women played in Oghuz society: Pletnyova, *Kochevniki yuzhnorusskikh stepey v epokhu srednevekov'ya (IV–XIII veka)*, 129.

63 On the discoveries of these artifacts in Southeastern Europe and their interpretation, see above. Fyodorov-Davydov wrote about the earpick (*kopoushka*) as a local feature of the steppes in the vicinity of the Volga and Southern Urals in the 9th to 11th centuries: Fyodorov-Davydov, *Kochevniki Vostochnoy Yevropy*, 141–2. Vladimir Krieger associates these decorations with the Oghuz population and believes that they indicate the worship of the female deity Umay: Krieger, *Kochevniki Yuzhnogo Priural'ya i Zavolzh'ya v sredniye veka, (X–XIV vv.)*, 12–8. Kruglov also considers these earpicks an attribute of the Oghuzes: Kruglov, "Pogrebal'nyy obryad oguzov Severnogo Prikaspiya 2-y pol. IX–1-y pol. XI v.," 395–446.

64 Garustovich and Ivanov, *Oguzy i pechenegi v Yevraziyskikh stepyakh*, 94; Ivanov, "Pogrebal'nyy obryad srednevekovykh kochevnikov," 126.

65 Andrii P. Kovalevskii, *Kniga Akhmeda ibn-Fadlana o yego puteshestvii na Volgu v 921–922 gg.: stat'i, perevody i kommentarii*, ed. Boris A. Shramko, (Kharkiv: Izdatel'stvo Khar'kovskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta im. A.M. Gor'kogo, 1956), 128.

66 Vladimir A. Ivanov, "Etnokul'turnaya karta zavolzhsko-priural'skoy chasti marshruta Ibn-Fadlana v Volzhskuyu Bolgariyu po dannym arkhologii," in *Na chest' zasluženoho diyacha nauky Ukrayiny Andriya Petrovycha Kovalivs'koho (1895–1969 rr.)*. *Mizhnarodna naukova konferentsiya, prysvyachena 100-richchyu vid dnya narodzhennya (1995; Kharkiv): tezy dopovidey*, ed. Anatolii I. Mitryaev (Kharkiv, 1995), 43.

moving into the North Pontic region in the second half of the 9th century.<sup>67</sup> Vladimir Ivanov is less categorical. He hypothesizes the existence of a European Patzinakia and trans-Volgan Patzinakia, placing the latter between the Volga (the area around present-day Samara and Saratov), the lower part of the Bolshoy Uzen River, the rivers of Maly Uzen and Ilek, the basin of the Samara, and the upper reaches of the Dim River in Bashkortostan. Ivanov extends the Pecheneg presence in this region into the 11th century.<sup>68</sup> Garustovich and Ivanov place the European Patzinakia of the 10th century between the Siverskyi Donets in the east, the Lower Southern Buh, Dniester, and Cogâlnic rivers in the west, and the Orel and Vorskla in the north. The researchers reject the idea that the Pechenegs reached in their migrations beyond the Danube and Seret, citing the lack of archaeological evidence.<sup>69</sup> They also consider the causes of Pecheneg incursions into Byzantium and discuss the catastrophic consequences of the Oghuzes' Balkan campaign, which, in their view, led to a demographic decline among the Torks-Uzes, traceable in the changing ratio of Oghuz to Pecheneg archaeological remains in the steppes of Right-Bank Ukraine.<sup>70</sup>

Vladimir Ivanov extends his arguments concerning the ethnic identity of burials, Oghuz or Pecheneg, to those found west of the Volga all the way to the Dniester.<sup>71</sup> At the same time, he ignores, or is unfamiliar with, the Balkan materials, notably those from the Odürtsi necropolis, which may cast doubt on Ivanov's theories about differences in the burial ritual between the Oghuzes and Pechenegs.<sup>72</sup>

67 Kruglov, "Pogrebal'nyy obryad oguzov Severnogo Prikaspiya 2-y pol. IX–1-y pol. XI v.," 423 and 429.

68 Vladimir I. Ivanov, "Zavolzhskaia Pechenegiia," in *Istoriia Samarskogo Povolzh'ya s drevneyshikh vremen do nashikh dney. Ranniy zheleznyy vek i srednevekov'ye*, eds. Petr S. Kabytov et al. (Moscow: Nauka, 2000), 275–6.

69 Gennadii N. Garustovich and Vladimir A. Ivanov, "Kochevniki Uralo-Povolzh'ya na etnokul'turnoy karte stepnoy Yevrazii epokhi srednevekov'ya," in Ivanov, Garustovich and Pylypchuk, *Srednevekovyye kochevniki na granitse Yevropy i Azii*, 185.

70 *Ibid.*, 192–4.

71 Ivanov, "Pogrebal'nyy obryad srednevekovykh kochevnikov," 132.

72 For instance, in the Odürtsi necropolis, which L. Doncheva-Petkova attributes to the Pechenegs, graves are often paved or marked with stones and contain a lot of jewelry, such as finger rings, pendants, or necklaces (*Odürtsi*, 2, 55–119). On the other hand, the relative poverty of those Volga-region burials that are considered Pecheneg may be evidence in favor of the "poverty" of the eastern branch of the Pechenegs, the so-called "cut-off Pechenegs" ("they have been cut off from their own folk": Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De administrando imperio*, 1, 169), as described, in no uncertain terms, by Ibn Fadlan: Kovalevskii, *Kniga Akhmeda ibn-Fadlana o yego puteshestvii na Volgu v 921–922 gg.: stat'i, perevody i kommentarii*, 130; *Ibn Fadlan's Reisebericht*, 33.



The study of Oghuz and Pecheneg sites in the region between the Don and the Urals will perhaps add nothing to our understanding of direct interactions between Byzantium and various nomads in the 10th and 11th centuries. However, it will significantly expand the body of archaeological data relating to nomadic material culture. This should help in the identification and attribution of nomadic remains in the zones of active contact between Byzantium and nomads – the Balkans and Crimea.

The broadening of the source base for the study of medieval nomadic burials has led to the appearance of works that potentially can refine our ability to attribute nomadic burials and settlements based on specific objects. Unfortunately, many of these works remain relatively unknown to specialists in the field. A notable example of this is Larisa Gavrilina's dissertation and articles devoted to nomadic personal adornments.<sup>73</sup>

Other valuable sources of dating information include weaponry, body armor, kettles, clothing, and horse harness. They are considered in the works of Anatolii Kirpichnikov,<sup>74</sup> Gheorghe Postică (see below),<sup>75</sup> Alexandr

---

73 Larisa M. Gavrilina, "Kochevnicheskiye ukrasheniya X veka," *SovArkh* (1985), no. 3, 220–4; Eadem, *Prikladnoye iskusstvo kochevnikov Vostochnoy Yevropy X-XIV vekov* [Candidate's thesis] (Moscow, 1986); Eadem, "Sbruynnye ukrasheniya u kochevnikov Vostochnoy Yevropy X-XI vv.," in *Arkheologicheskiye issledovaniya Kalmykii*, eds. Evgenii V. Tsutskin et al. (Elista: KNIIIFE, 1987), 54–68; Larisa M. Gavrilina, "Metallicheskiye ukrasheniya sbrui iz kochevnicheskogo pogrebeniya X veka v Nizhnem Povolzh'ye," in *Materialy po arkheologii Kalmykii*, ed. Yevgenii V. Tsutskin (Elista: Kalmytskiy Institut obshchestvennykh nauk AN SSSR, 1991), 147–55. The subject of the nomadic decorative arts is considered in the works of Svetlana Salangina, Elena Polyakova, Ruslan Orlov, Svitlana Ryabtseva, and Vladimir Ivanov: Ruslan S. Orlov, "Pivnichnoprachornomors'kyy tsentr khudozhn'oyi metaloobrobky u X–XI st.," *Arkheolohiya* 47, (1984), 24–44; Svetlana V. Salangina, *Kopoushki kak istoricheskiy istochnik (po materialam arkheologicheskikh pamyatnikov Vostochnoy Yevropy)* [Candidate's thesis] (Izhevsk, 2004); Olga A. Polyakova, "Lazuritovyye podveski iz pogrebeniy kochevnikov Yugo-Vostochnoy Yevropy XI–XIII vv.," *Stepi Yevropy v epokhu srednevekov'ya* 10 (2012), 281–98; Ryabtseva, "O listovidnykh ukrasheniyakh, podveskakh, kopoushках i reshmakh"; Vladimir A. Ivanov, "Kul'turnyye svyazi srednevekovykh kochevnikov Yevrazii po materialam dekorativno-prikladnogo iskusstva," in *Drevnyurkskiy mir. Istoriya i traditsiya*, eds. Ildus K. Zagidullin et al. (Kazan: Institut istorii Akademii nauk Respubliki Tatarstan, 2002), 106–24.

74 Anatolii N. Kirpichnikov, *Snaryazheniye vsadnika i verkhovogo konya na Rusi IX–XIII vv.* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1973).

75 Postică, "Glinyanne kotly na territorii Moldavii v rannesrednevekovy period."

Medvedev,<sup>76</sup> Valentyn Kishchenko,<sup>77</sup> Kateryna Armarchuk,<sup>78</sup> Emil Seydaliev,<sup>79</sup> Mark Kramarovskii,<sup>80</sup> Ion Ursu,<sup>81</sup> Volodymyr Dorofeyev,<sup>82</sup> Kirill A. Mikhailov, Sergeĭ Yu. Kainov,<sup>83</sup> Oleksiĭ Komar,<sup>84</sup> and Oleh Dubynets.<sup>85</sup> In 2000, Oleksandr Yevhlevskii and Tetyana Potyomkina published a study of “The Late Nomadic Sabers of Eastern Europe,” in which they employed methods of mathematical statistics in developing a system of chronological and territorial classification of various types of sabers. As classificatory characteristics, they used blade curvature, length, breadth, and proportions, as well as sections of maximum curvature.<sup>86</sup> Yevhlevskii and Potyomkina have also done similar work on steels for fire kindling and on nomadic pottery – amphorae, pots, and jugs.<sup>87</sup>

76 Alexandr F. Medvyedyev, *Ruchnoye metatel'noye oruzhiye. Luk i strely, samostrel VIII-XIV vv.* (Moscow: Nauka, 1966).

77 Valentyn G. Kishchenko, “Strely drevnikh i srednevekovykh kul'tur Yevrazii: Rekonstruktsiya,” *Stepi Yevropy v epokhu srednevekov'ya* 3 (2003), 131–91.

78 Ekaterina A. Armarchuk, *Konskaya upryazh' iz mogil'nikov Severo-Vostochnogo Prichernomor'ya X-XIII vv.* (Moscow: Institut arkhologii RAN, 2006).

79 Emil I. Seydaliev, “K voprosu o vliyaniĭ Vizantii na voyennoye delo kochevnikov Severnogo Prichernomor'ya: obzor istochnikov X-XIII vv.,” *Antichnaya drevnost' i sredniye veka* 42 (2013), 85–92; Idem, “Metatel'noye oruzhiye kochevnikov Severnogo Prichernomor'ya i Kryma v XI–XIV vv.,” *Pratsi Tsentru pam'yatkoznavstva* 20 (2011), 227–34.

80 Mark G. Kramarovskii, “Kumanskiye poyasa v Desht-i Kipchake i na Balkanakh v XIII-XIV vv.,” in *Tyurkologicheskii sbornik 2003-2004 (Tyurkskiye narody v drevnosti i srednevekov'ye)*, ed. Sergeĭ G. Klyashtornyi et al. (Moscow: Vostochnaya literatura, 2005), 126–41.

81 Ion Ursu, “Pieșe din echipamentul de apărare descoperite în complexe funerare ale turanicilor târzii,” *Revista Arheologică* 9 (2013), no. 2, 104–10; Idem, “Sabia la populațiile turanice din spațiul carpato-nistean în secolele X-XIV,” *Revista Arheologică* 10 (2014), no. 1–2, 174–80.

82 Volodymyr V. Dorofeyev, “Tipologiya polovetskikh kolchanov XI–XIII vv. iz kurganov Yuga Ukrainy,” in *Aktual'nyye problemy arkhologicheskikh issledovaniy v Ukrainskoy SSR* (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1981), 125–6.

83 Kirill A. Mikhailov and Sergeĭ Yu. Kainov, “Finds of structural details of composite bows from Ancient Rus,” *Acta Archaeologica ASH* 62 (2011), no. 1, 221–37. This study demonstrates that two types of bows – “Hungarian” and “Pecheneg” (“Turkic”) – were used in Rus'.

84 Oleksiĭ V. Komar, *Istoriya i arkhologiya drevnikh mad'yar v epokhu migratsii – A korai magyarság vándorlásának történeti és régészeti emlékei* (Budapest: Martin Opitz Kiadó, 2018), 215–25; Oleksiĭ V. Komar and Tetyana I. Shelemetyeva, “Pechenezhskiy nabor ukrasheniy uzdy iz nakhodki u s. Balki,” *Stratum Plus* (2019), no. 5, 209–23.

85 Dubynets, “K voprosu o kul'turnoy interpretatsii odnosostavnykh udil'.”

86 Olexandr V. Yevhlevskii and Tetyana M. Potyomkina, “Vostochnoyevropeyskiye pozdnekochevnicheskiye sabli,” *Stepi Yevropy v epokhu srednevekov'ya* 1 (2000), 117–79.

87 Olexandr V. Yevhlevskii and Tetyana M. Potyomkina, “Kresala v pozdnekochevnicheskikh pogrebeniyakh Vostochnoy Yevropy,” *Stepi Yevropy v epokhu srednevekov'ya* 1 (2000), 181–208; Olexandr V. Yevhlevskii and Tetyana M. Potyomkina, “O nekotorykh vidakh goncharnoy keramiki u vostochnoyevropeyskikh nomadov razvitoĭ srednevekov'ya,” *Stepi*

Oleksandr Yevhlevskii has started work on the project *The Compendium of the Medieval Turkic Sculptures of Eurasia*, which will encompass medieval sculptures from China to Bulgaria.<sup>88</sup>

### 1.2 *11th- to 12th-Century Nomadic Archaeological Remains in the Prut-Dniester Region*

First discoveries of medieval nomadic artifacts in the Prut-Dniester region were made as early as 1896–1910 by Yoel Stempkovskii. Using unpaid convict labor, he excavated 412 kurgans on the left bank of the Dniester. Approximately 90 of them are now attributed to the nomads of the late 9th to 14th century.<sup>89</sup> However, most of the archaeological discoveries relating to the Pechenegs, Torks, and Cumans were made in the second half of the 20th century, after the creation of the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic (Moldavian SSR or MSSR).<sup>90</sup>

---

*Yevropy v epokhu srednevekov'ya* 1 (2000), 209–26. Potyomkina has published articles on metalware in nomadic burials: Tetyana M. Potyomkina, "Sotsiokul'turnyy aspekt zhen'skikh polovetskikh pogrebeniy so statusnymi predmetami," *Donets'kyi arkhеолоhichnyy zbirnyk* 13–14 (2010), 135–44; Eadem, "Metallicheskiye posudovidnyye izdeliya iz pogrebeniy nomadov zolotoordynskogo vremeni Vostochnoy Yevropy: problemy i stereotipy," *Stepi Yevropy v epokhu srednevekov'ya* 11 (2012), 279–306; Eadem, "Etnokul'turnyy i sotsial'nyy aspekty pozdnekochevnicheskikh pogrebeniy s kotlom," *Arkheologicheskyye zapiski* 7 (2012), 287–96. On this subject, see also: Mikhail L. Shvetsov, "Kotly iz pogrebeniy srednevekovykh kochevnikov," *SovArkh* (1980), no. 2, 192–202; Victor N. Chkhaidze, "Kotly iz pogrebeniy kochevnikov Stepnogo Predkavkaz'ya XI–XIV vv.," *Kratkiye soobshcheniya IA RAN* 237 (2015), 280–91.

88 Three volumes had come out by the end of 2017: *The Northern Azov Littoral*, *The Lands between the Don, Mius, and Calmius*, and *The Lands between the Mius and Calmius*. However, they are not available to the wider academic community because they were published in the Russian-occupied territory of Ukraine's Donetsk region. Before Yevhlevskii, medieval steppe sculptures were studied in Ukrainian historiography by Yaroslav Dashkevych and Lyubov Geras'kova: Yaroslav R. Dashkevych, Edward Tryjarski, *Kamennyye baby Prichernomorskikh stepy. Kolleksiya iz Askanii-Nova* (Wrocław/Warsaw/ Cracow: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1982); Lyubov S. Geras'kova, *Skul'ptura seredn'ovichnykh kochovykiv stepiv Skhidnoyi Yevropy* (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1991). Both works stress the likelihood that these objects were left not only by Cumans (Dashkevych and Tryjarski, *Kamennyye baby Prichernomorskikh stepy. Kolleksiya iz Askanii-Nova*, 42–9; Geras'kova, *Skul'ptura seredn'ovichnykh kochovykiv stepiv Skhidnoyi Yevropy*, 98–101).

89 Dobrolyubskii, *Kochevniki Severo-Zapadnogo Prichernomor'ya v epokhu srednevekov'ya*, 10–3.

90 It was created on 2 August 1940 out of parts of Bessarabia (a region annexed from Romania on 28 June of that year) and parts of the Moldavian Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic within the Ukrainian SSR. The peace treaty signed in Paris in 1947 recognized Soviet sovereignty over Moldavia. The annexation was followed by a mass population displacement: in 1941, 30,000 Romanians and Moldavians were deported from the MSSR

After World War II, the Soviet regime strove to legitimize its new territorial acquisitions. Thus, along with Sovietization and Russification, the government implemented in Moldavia a policy of Slavization. It was imperative to prove that the “Eastern Slavs,” the forebears of Kyivan Rus’ and then Russia and the USSR, inhabited these lands from very early times. As the Odessa archaeologist Andrii Dobrolyubskii wrote in jest, even “the primitive peoples of the Paleolithic era, naturally, were Slavs.”<sup>91</sup> Archaeology in this case had to compensate for the lack of written sources.<sup>92</sup>

In 1947, the management of archaeological excavations in the territory between the Prut and the Dniester was transferred from the local institutes to Moscow and Leningrad.<sup>93</sup> The full-scale archaeological exploration of the Prut-Dniester region began in 1950 with the Slavic-Dniester Expedition (renamed in 1953 to the Moldavian Expedition, and again in 1957 to the Prut-Dniester Expedition<sup>94</sup>) under the direction of Georgii Fyodorov (1917–92).<sup>95</sup> In its search for the Tivertsii of the Rus’ chronicles, the expedition discovered sites of the Poieniști-Lucășeuca culture of the late 3rd to

---

and the Chernivtsi and Izmail Regions of the Ukrainian SSR; in 1949, another 36,000 were deported from Moldavia, and in 1951–2,600 more: Pavel Polyan, *Ne po svoey vole ... Istoriya i geografiya prinuditel'nykh migratsiy v SSSR* (Moscow: Memorial, 2001), 101, 140 and 143.

91 Andrii O. Dobrolyubskii, *Odesseya odnogo arkheologa* (Kyiv, 2013), 59. See also: Gheorghe Postică, *Civilizația medievală timpurie din spațiul pruto-nistean (secolele V-XIII)* (Bibliotheca Archaeologica Moldaviae, 7) (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române, 2007), 66–70.

92 See: Sergeï R. Matveev, “Teoriya i real'nost' v etnicheskoy identifikatsii rannesrednevekovykh arkheologicheskikh kul'tur Pruto-Dnestrovskogo mezhdurech'ya vo vtoroy polovine XX veka,” *Revistă Științifică a Universității de Stat din Moldova* 4 (64) (2013), 76–9.

93 Victoria Kolesnikova and Anna Yanenko, “Ukrainsko-moldavskiy arkheologicheskiy issledovaniya 30-40 gg. XX stoletiya: plany i realizatsiya,” *Revista Arheologică* 9 (2013), no. 1, 232. A brief history of the archaeological study of the burials of the Lower Dniester region is given in Vitalii Sinica, Sergeï Razumov and Nikolai Telnov, *Kurgany u sela Butory* (Tiraspol: Pridnestrovskiy gosudarstvennyy universitet im. T.G. Shevchenko, 2013), 5–16.

94 Gheorghe Postică notes the ubiquity of the adjectives “Slavic” and “Ancient Rus’” in the titles of many of the expedition’s publications (“Slavic Remains in Moldavia,” “The Slavs of the Dniester Region,” “Ancient Slavs in Moldavia,” “Slavic Settlements in Moldavia,” “An Ancient Rus’ Town on the Dniester,” “The Main Results and Tasks of the Study of the Ancient Slavic Culture of the USSR’s South-West,” and others), as well as in the names of other archaeological expeditions (such as the Slavic Expedition, Southern Slavic Archaeological Expedition, Eastern Slavic Expedition, Ancient Rus’ Expedition, Slavic-Moldavian Expedition, or the Early Slavic Branch of the Slavic-Moldavian Expedition): Postică, *Civilizația medievală timpurie din spațiul pruto-nistean (secolele V-XIII)*, 33 and 41.

95 Mark Tkachuk, “Georgiy Borisovich Fedorov (1917–1992),” *Stratum plus* (1999), no. 5, 7–13.

1st century BC, numerous settlements and grave fields of the Chernyakhov or Sântana de Mureș culture, early Slavs, and the Balkan-Danubian culture.<sup>96</sup>

In the 1960s, the expedition expanded to form several distinct branches. Georgii Chebotarenko ran the branch focusing on the study of the Balkan-Danubian culture. In 1969, he published the article “Materials for an Archaeological Map” which outlined the state of the material culture of the region’s population at the time of the arrival of the Pechenegs.<sup>97</sup> Relics of nomadic presence could not have been uncovered in the early stages of the Prut-Dniester Expedition’s work because, in keeping with Georgii Fyodorov’s theories, the archaeologists were looking for Slavic remains in places unfavorable to nomadic raiding activity – in the Codru uplands of Central Moldavia, far from the Budjak Steppe and large rivers.<sup>98</sup>

A wave of large-scale excavations began in the mid-1960s due to the construction of the Tatarbunar irrigation system in the region of the Lower

96 Georgii B. Fyodorov, *Naseleniye Prutsko-Dnestrovskogo mezhdurech'ya v I tysyachetii n.e.* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk sssr, 1960); Georgii B. Fyodorov and Vera M. Negrușa, “Slavyane i balkano-dunayskaya arkheologicheskaya kul'tura,” in *Kompleksnyye problemy istorii i kul'tury narodov Tsentral'noy i Yugo-Vostochnoy Yevropy. Itogi i perspektivy issledovaniy*, 48–56; Georgii B. Fyodorov and Georgii F. Chebotarenko, *Pamyatniki drevnikh slavyan (VI–XIII vv.)* (Kishinev: Shtiintsa, 1974). On this archaeological culture, see also: Vladimir I. Kozlov, *Naseleniye stepnogo mezhdurech'ya Dunaya i Dnestra kontsa VIII–nachala XI vekov n. e.: Balkano-Dunayskaya kul'tura* (Chișinău: Stratum Plus, 2015). Vladimir Kozlov (1952–2001) made a number of observations regarding Bulgaro-Pecheneg coexistence in the 10th century. In his view, the northeastern border of Bulgaria under Tsar Simeon lay on the right bank of the Dniester and its tributary the Byk River. For a long time, the Pechenegs were Bulgaria’s allies. In the role of the destroyers of settlements in the Dniester region, which pushed the majority of the population to migrate to the Danube, Kozlov sees in the 9th century the Magyars, and in the 11th – for some reason not the Pechenegs, but Torks-Oghuzes: Idem, “Zur Siedlungsstruktur der Nordostprovinz des Ersten Bulgarenreiches,” in *Byzantium, Pliska and the Balkans*, 469 and 475.

97 Georgii F. Chebotarenko, “Materialy k arkheologicheskoy karte pamyatnikov VII–X vv. yuzhnoy chasti Pruto-Dnestrovskogo mezhdurech'ya,” in *Dalekoye proshloye Moldavii*, eds. Lazar' L. Polyevoi et al. (Kishinev: Redaktsionno-izdatel'skiy otdel Akademii nauk Moldavskoy SSR, 1969), 211–29.

98 More than 400 arrowheads were discovered during the excavations at the sites of Echimăuți and Alcedar under the direction of Fyodorov. Having analysed 279 arrowheads, researcher from Chișinău Semyon Chera came to the conclusion that at least 18 percent of them could be attributed to the Pechenegs, Uzes, or Cumans: Semyon Chera, “K voprosu o vydelenii finno-ugorskogo komponenta v kollektzii nakonechnikov strel s gorodishch Alchedar i Yekimautsy,” *Stratum plus* (2013), no. 5, 197–202.

Danube.<sup>99</sup> The Ukrainian archaeologist Mykola Shmaglii (1931–94)<sup>100</sup> was the head of the Dniester-Danube Archaeological Expedition in the area. In just the first three years of fieldwork, the expedition discovered over 300 burials from different periods, including 15 burials belonging to medieval nomads.<sup>101</sup>

Beginning in the 1970s, kurgan excavations in the region grew even broader and more systematic. Leonid Subbotin's Danube-Dniester Expedition and the Izmail Expedition under the direction of Alexandr Gudkov were heavily involved in this work.<sup>102</sup> The Căușeni Project expedition, which undertook rescue excavations during the construction of the Ananyiv-Tiraspol-Izmail gas pipeline, studied ten kurgans near the village of Cărnățeni and along the Bender-Bolhrad highway between the villages of Săiți and Opacii and found eleven burials of medieval nomads there, dated to the 10th–12th centuries.<sup>103</sup> Numerous nomadic burials were brought to light by the Lower Prut and Prut construction expeditions (documents relating to these expeditions are preserved in the archives of the Academy of Sciences of Moldova)<sup>104</sup> and by the Cahul Expedition of 1990–91 in the construction zone of the Cahul Irrigation System.<sup>105</sup> In the 1970s and 1980s, special rescue excavations of individual sites (kurgans and groups of kurgans) sometimes had to be carried out as well.<sup>106</sup> By the mid-1980s, over 150 medieval nomadic burials and a few dozen burials

- 
- 99 As Alexandru Madgearu pointed out, in “Serbia, the building of the power plants in the Iron Gates region offered the opportunity for many rescue excavations” (Madgearu, *Byzantine Military Organization on the Danube*, 3). Industrialization and archaeology were closely linked in the 20th century.
- 100 Mykola M. Shmaglii and Ivan T. Chernyakov, “Arkheologicheskiye issledovaniya v zone stroitel'stva Nizhnednestrovskoy orositel'noy sistemy,” in *Arkheologicheskiye issledovaniya na Ukraine v 1968 g.*, ed. Evgenii V. Maksymov (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1971), 36–40.
- 101 Mykola M. Shmaglii and Ivan T. Chernyakov, “Issledovaniya kurganov v stepnoy chasti mezhdurech'ya Dunaya i Dnestra (1964–1966 gg.),” in *Kurgany stepnoy chasti mezhdurech'ya Dunaya i Dnestra (Materialy po arkheologii Severnogo Prichernomor'ya)*, issue 6, *Trudy Dnepro-Dunayskoy novostroyechnoy ekspeditsii 1963–1967 gg.*, part 1, 90.
- 102 Georgii F. Chebotarenko, Evgenii V. Yarovoï and Nikolaï P. Telnov, *Kurgany Budzhakskoy stepi* (Kishinev: Shtiintsa, 1989), 9.
- 103 Tetiana I. Demchenko and Georgii F. Chebotarenko, “Pogrebeniya kochevnikov v kurganakh Nizhnego Podnestrov'ya,” in *Srednevekovyie pamyatniki Dnestrovsko-Prutskogo mezhdurech'ya*, ed. Pavel Byrnâ, (Kishinev: Shtiintsa, 1988), 95–105.
- 104 Postică, *Civilizația medievală timpurie din spațiul pruto-nistean (secolele V–XIII)*, 448–60 (Table №3).
- 105 Sergeï Agulnicov and Ion Ursu, “Complexe funerare tumulare din zona Prutu lui Inferior,” *Revista Arheologică* 4 (2008), no. 1, 61–79.
- 106 Natalia L. Serova and Yevgenii V. Yarovoï, *Grigoriopol'skiye kurgany* (Kishinev: Shtiintsa, 1987), 7. For a list of locations across the Prut-Dniester region where nomadic burials have been found, see: Postică, *Civilizația medievală timpurie din spațiul pruto-nistean (secolele V–XIII)*, 448–60 (Table №3); Ioniță, “Observații asupra mormintelor,” 115–50.

that could hypothetically be attributed to medieval nomads were known in this area.<sup>107</sup>

Moldavian and Ukrainian historiography of the 1960s and 1970s paid very little attention to the 10th- to 13th-century nomads.<sup>108</sup> There were a number of reasons for this. The main one was that these medieval nomads were not Slavs, and so studying them did little for one's career prospects in academia. The standard practice in Soviet archaeology was the allotment of one topic (an archaeological culture or a particular site) to one person.<sup>109</sup> A scholar leading an archaeological expedition that explored kurgans in a construction zone for a future irrigation canal or gas pipeline would focus primarily on the settlements and burials of the culture that was his or her academic specialty. Nomadic burials unearthed along the way could be mentioned in the expedition report (which would be archived at the Institute of Archaeology or some other organization), but omitted from the published write-up of the expedition's work. As a rule, medieval nomadic burials were additions to earlier kurgans, contained little if any inventory, and were difficult to interpret. That is why, as Andrii Dobrolyubskii recalls, "they razed those burials with bulldozers, did not want to see them. They said those remains were not worth any attention."<sup>110</sup>

Nevertheless, thanks to the industrial scale of archaeological fieldwork in the MSSR and Odessa Region of Ukraine, such a large number of medieval nomadic burials were discovered that they could no longer be ignored. The Moldavian archaeologist Georgii Chebotarenko (1927–2014) was the first to attempt their systematic historical interpretation.<sup>111</sup> As an active participant in, and later director of, the Prut-Dniester Expedition, Chebotarenko studied 8th- to

107 Dobrolyubskii, *Kochevniki Severo-Zapadnogo Prichernomor'ya v epokhu srednevekov'ya*, 14; Gheorghe Postică, Eugen Sava and Sergeï Agulnicov, "Morminte ale nomazilor turanici medievale din tumulii de lângă Taraclia și Cazaclia," *Memoria Antiquitatis* 20 (1995), 141 and 159.

108 Georgii B. Fyodorov, "Naseleniye Yugo-Zapada SSSR v I – nachale II tysyacheletiya nashey ery," *SovEthn* (1961), no. 5, 105; Nikolai A. Mokhov, *Moldaviya epokhi feodalizma. Ot drevneyshikh vremen do nachala XIX v.* (Kishinev: Cartea Moldovenească, 1964), 76–7.

109 Dobrolyubskii, *Odesseya odnogo arkheologa*, 58–60.

110 *Ibid.*, 60. On the destruction of burials: *Ibid.*, 173–4. Andrii Dobrolyubskii also recalls manipulations with the size of kurgans under excavation. The larger the kurgan, the more money was allocated for its exploration – thus a small kurgan could "grow" in reports. However, according to Dobrolyubskii, academic reports were more honest: *Ibid.*, 122 and 129.

111 Nikolai P. Telnov, "Pamyati Georgiya Feoktistovicha Chebotarenko," *Revista Arheologică* 10 (2014), no. 1–2, 334–6.

10th-century sites and defended a Candidate's thesis on the Balkan-Danubian culture, which he identified with the First Bulgarian Empire.<sup>112</sup>

Chebotarenko's book *The Population of the Central Part of the Dniester-Prut Interfleuve in the 10th to 12th Centuries* came out in 1982.<sup>113</sup> Following Pletnyova, who wrote extensively on the subject of the gradual sedentarization of nomads under the influence of farmers, as well as Vladimir Korolyuk's idea about the region's role as a contact zone during the Middle Ages, Chebotarenko argued that 11th-century Moldavia was a place of meeting and interaction between the Southern and Eastern Slavs and nomads, who began settling in these lands as early as the 10th century. Chebotarenko dated the nomadic remains found at the medieval settlements of Hansca, Molești, Logănești, and others to the 10th century, but for some reason attributed them to the Cumans.<sup>114</sup>

In 1989, Chebotarenko coauthored the monograph *The Kurgans of the Budjak Steppe*, in which the authors analyzed and interpreted, among others, 46 medieval nomadic burials. The "ethnicity" of the burials was determined only based on the orientation of the bodies. Avoiding chronological precision, the authors dated most of the discovered late-nomadic burials to the 11th and 12th centuries. In the view of Georgii Chebotarenko and Nikolai Telnov, until the beginning of the 11th century Southern Slavs (Bulgarians) densely inhabited the area between the left bank of the Lower Danube and the right bank of the Lower Dniester, while Pechenegs appeared in these lands from the mid-10th century on only sporadically.<sup>115</sup> Interestingly, the authors of *The Kurgans of the Budjak Steppe* did not use paleoanthropological data, which is unusual for Chebotarenko's work.<sup>116</sup> Among the latter's other important contributions

112 Georgii F. Chebotarenko, "K voprosu ob etnicheskoy prinadlezhnosti balkano-dunayskoy kul'tury v yuzhnoy chasti Prutsko-Dnestrovskogo mezhdurech'ya," in *Etnicheskaya istoriya vostochnykh romantsev (Drevnost' i sredniye veka)*, ed. Vladimir D. Korolyuk (Moscow: Nauka, 1979), 86–105.

113 Georgii F. Chebotarenko, *Naseleniye tsentral'noy chasti Dnestrovsko-Prutskogo mezhdurech'ya v X–XII vv.* (Kishinev: Shtiintsa, 1982).

114 Ibid., 6 and 57. In a later article, published in 1990, the Pechenegs are mentioned as inhabitants of Molești: Georgii F. Chebotarenko, "Issledovaniya na rannesrednevekovom poselenii Moleshty I," 237–8.

115 Chebotarenko, Yarovoï and Telnov, *Kurgany Budzhakskoy stepi*, 193–5. It appears that the works of Spinei and Diaconu, who studied similar sites west of the Prut, were unknown to Chebotarenko and Telnov. Furthermore, the Moldavian archaeologists did not engage with the work of Dobrolyubskii, who addressed many of the same issues in a monograph (*Kochivnyky Pivnichno-Zakhidnoho Prychornomor'ya doby seredn'ovichchya*, 1986) and numerous articles.

116 Based on the paleoanthropological analysis of the grave fields at Hansca-Limbari, he argued for the existence of a symbiosis between the region's nomads and settled population (Chebotarenko, "K voprosu ob etnicheskoy prinadlezhnosti balkano-dunayskoy



are the study of a medieval pottery workshop at the settlement of Molești-I, where approximately two thousand clay kettles were found, and the discovery of assemblages of clay kettles at Hansca and Logănești.<sup>117</sup>

Much more thorough and wide-ranging has been the oeuvre of Andrii Dobrolyubskii, who has devoted 35 years of his life to fieldwork in Ukraine, Moldavia, Central Asia, and Northern Caucasus.<sup>118</sup> Dobrolyubskii's work is distinguished by close attention to issues of methodology. Thus, in a study he coauthored with A. Dzigovskii, he attempted to date and determine the ethnicity of a range of medieval nomadic burials based on G. Fyodorov-Davydov's methods.<sup>119</sup> Analyzing one such burial, he showed that Fyodorov-Davydov's theoretical constructions, when applied to new finds, could yield paradoxical results: the burial was "Pecheneg-Tork" in its ritual, while its inventory put

---

kul'tury," 101). In 1984, Chebotarenko coauthored a monograph on the Brănești burial assemblage: Georgii B. Fyodorov, Georgii F. Chebotarenko and Marina S. Velikanova, *Braneshtskiy mogilnik X–XI vv.* (Kishinev: Shtiintsa, 1984).

117 Georgii F. Chebotarenko, "Issledovaniya na rannesrednevekovom poselenii Moleshty I"; Georgii F. Chebotarenko and Nikolaï P. Telnov, "Issledovaniya yuzhnoslavyanskoy ekspeditsii v 1979 g.," in *Arkheologicheskiye issledovaniya v Moldavii v 1979-1980 gg.*, ed. Ilya A. Borziac (Kishinev: Shtiintsa, 1983), 97–101. In Moldavia, clay kettles have also been found at such settlement sites as Dănceni, Calfa, Cigîrleni, Chișinău (Durlești), Tochiile-Răducani, and Cîrnățeni. See: Postică, "Glinyanyye kotly na territorii Moldavii v rannesrednevekovyy period." See also: Ion Tentiuc, *Populația din Moldova centrală în secolele XI–XIII* (Iași: Helios, 1996), 119 and 246.

118 He defended his Candidate's dissertation in 1981 at the Institute of Archaeology of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR on "The Nomads of the Late 11th to 14th Century in the Western Part of the North Pontic Steppe (Problems of Ethnic and Social Development in Light of Archaeological Data)." Before that, he published a number of articles on the medieval archaeology of the area between the Dniester and Danube: Andrii O. Dobrolyubskii and Anatoliï G. Zagynaylo, "Opyt svodnogo kartografirovaniya arkheologicheskikh pamyatnikov (na materialakh yugo-zapadnykh rayonov Odesskoy oblasti)," in *Arkheologicheskiye i arkheograficheskiye issledovaniya na territorii Yuzhnoy Ukrainy*, ed. Zaira V. Pershina et al. (Kyiv/Odessa: Vyshecha shkola, 1976), 92–111; Andrii O. Dobrolyubskii and Olexandr M. Dzigovskii, "Pamyatniki kochevnikov IX–XIV vv. na zapade prichernomorskikh stepey (materialy k arkheologicheskoy karte)," in *Pamyatniki drevnikh kul'tur Severo-Zapadnogo Prichernomor'ya*, ed. Petro O. Karyshkovskii (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1981), 134–44. In 1991, Dobrolyubskii defended a doctoral dissertation on "Nomads in the Western Pontic Steppes, 10th to 18th Centuries (a Historical and Archaeological Study)." The dissertation later became the basis for a book he co-wrote with Ihor Smirnov: *Kochovyky Pivdenno-Zakhidnoyi Ukrayiny v X–XVII stolittiyakh* (Mykolaiv: Ilion, 2011).

119 Dobrolyubskii and Dzigovskii, "Pamyatniki kochevnikov IX–XIV vv. na zapade prichernomorskikh stepey (materialy k arkheologicheskoy karte)."

it in the 13th to 14th centuries.<sup>120</sup> Pointing this out, Dobrolyubskii suggested that Fyodorov-Davydov's breakthroughs in the attribution of burials should be employed with an eye toward the specifics of each particular region.

This approach to medieval nomadic burials, which represent the main archaeological source for the history of nomads in the region, allowed Dobrolyubskii to weave the nomads into the "written" history of the Dniester-Danube lands. In a series of works published in 1982–86,<sup>121</sup> Dobrolyubskii introduced new sources for the study of burials (particularly those excavated by Y. Stempkovskii), considered the dates of the first appearance of the Pechenegs, Torks, and Cumans between the Prut and Dniester, analyzed their contacts with the settled population of the region, and attempted to connect individual archaeological sites with specific nomadic ethnic groups.

In his monograph *The Nomads of the Northwestern Pontic Lands in the Middle Ages*,<sup>122</sup> Dobrolyubskii proposed a chronological and ethnic attribution for the materials of over 160 burial complexes discovered by 1983. Of this total, 49 belonged to Fyodorov-Davydov's first period (late 9th to 11th centuries) and 26 – to the second period (last quarter of the 11th to 12th centuries). Dobrolyubskii disputed the possibility that the Cumans came to dominate this region not just by the end of the 11th, or even as late as in the 12th century. In

120 Andrii O. Dobrolyubskii, "Pogrebeniye kochevnika u s. Plavni," in *Drevnosti Severo-Zapadnogo Prichernomor'ya*, ed. Galyna G. Mezentseva (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1981), 134.

121 Idem, "Etnicheskii sostav kochevogo naseleniya Severo-Zapadnogo Prichernomor'ya v zolotoordynskoye vremya," in *Pamyatniki rimskogo i srednevekovogo vremeni v Severo-Zapadnom Prichernomor'ye*, ed. Olexandra V. Gudkova (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1982), 28–39; Andrii O. Dobrolyubskii and Leonid V. Subbotin, "Pogrebeniye srednevekovogo kochevnika u sela Trapovka," in *Pamyatniki rimskogo i srednevekovogo vremeni v Severo-Zapadnom Prichernomor'ye*, 168–73; Andrii O. Dobrolyubskii and Olena S. Stolyaryk, "Vizantiys'ki monety u kochivnyts'komu pokhovanni XII st. u Dnistro-Dunays'komu mizhrichchi," *Arkheolohiya* (1983), no. 4, 71–75; Andrii O. Dobrolyubskii "Drevnosti srednevekovykh kochevnikov v Nizhnem Podnestrov'ye (materialy raskopok I.Ya. Stempkovskogo)," in *Kurgany v zonakh novostroyek Moldavii*, eds. Ivan I. Artemenko et al. (Kishinev: Shtiintsa, 1984), 153–74; Idem, "Mogil'niki srednevekovykh kochevnikov v mezhdurech'ye Dnestra i Dunaya," in *Pamyatniki drevney istorii Severo-Zapadnogo Prichernomor'ya*, eds. Ganna O. Dzis-Rayko et al. (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1985), 85–92; Svitlana I. Andrukha, Andrii O. Dobrolyubskii and Gennadii N. Toshchev, *Kurgany u sela Plavni v nizov'yakh Dunaya* (Odessa, 1985); Andrii O. Dobrolyubskii and Nikolai D. Russev, "Novyye aspekty izucheniya kochevnicheskikh drevnostey na zapade Zolotoy Ordy," in *Arkheologicheskyye issledovaniya*, 59–66; Andrii O. Dobrolyubskii and Nikolai D. Russev, "Kochevoye i osedloye naseleniye stepey Severo-Zapadnogo Prichernomor'ya v X-XIV vv.," in *Issledovaniya po arkheologii Severo-Zapadnogo Prichernomor'ya*, eds. Volodymyr N. Stanko et al. (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986), 177–84.

122 Pletnyova published a critical response to this book: Pletnyova, *Kochevniki yuzhnorusskikh stepey v epokhu srednevekov'ya (IV–XIII veka)*, 133.

his view, the population of the region in the 10th and 11th centuries was mostly Pecheneg, and later Pecheneg-Tork. He also doubted that the region's nomads could have transitioned to a sedentary lifestyle under the influence of the local farmers in the 10th to 12th centuries.<sup>123</sup>

Burials are the most important markers of medieval nomadic presence in the region between the Prut and Dniester. However, in addition to burials, the nomads left other traces of their life and occupations in the area. While remains of nomadic dwellings are rather difficult to recover,<sup>124</sup> pottery is less susceptible to the ravages of time. In 1985, Gheorghe Postică, at that time a young Moldavian archaeologist, published an article devoted to the finds of clay kettles in Moldavia.<sup>125</sup> Based on his analysis of a large number of artifacts, the author divided them into three types: pot-like (type I), cauldron-like (type II), and pail-like (type III). He dated the kettles of types I and III to the 10th and early 11th centuries and linked them with the ancient Bulgarian population, and kettles of type II – to the second half of the 10th to 12th centuries, attributing them to the Pechenegs.<sup>126</sup>

Gheorghe Postică's habilitation thesis on *The Early Medieval Civilization in the Prut-Dniester Area (5th to 13th Centuries)* was published in 2007. In it, he attempts to bring together all known nomadic burials in the region. He lists 562 burials of 10th- to 14th-century nomads found in 363 barrow necropolises, sorting them into seven chronological groups. He attributes group I (10th to 11th centuries, 39 burials) to the Pechenegs and partially to Uzes, and groups II to IV (10th to the first half of 13th centuries, 80 burials) to the Cumans and partially Pechenegs. Group VII includes burials dating broadly between the 10th and 14th centuries, 326 in total.<sup>127</sup> To underscore the relatively small proportion

123 Dobrolyubskii, *Kochevniki Severo-Zapadnogo Prichernomor'ya v epokhu srednevekov'ya*, 31–60. Recently, an ethnic attribution of the nomadic burials of the Prut-Dniester region was proposed by Vitalii Jeleznii. Analyzing 83 of them, he attempts to differentiate between Pecheneg and Uz burials: Vitalii Jeleznii, "K voprosu o spetsifike pechenezhskikh i uzskikh pogrebeniy Pruto-Dnestrovskogo regiona," *Revista Arheologică* 12 (2016), no. 1–2, 199–215.

124 See: Alekseï V. Korobeynikov, *Imitatsionnoye modelirovaniye po dannym arkheologii* (Izhevsk: Kamskiy institut gumanitarnykh i inzhenernykh tekhnologii, 2006), 80.

125 Postică, "Glinyanye kotly na territorii Moldavii v rannesrednevekovyy period," 227–40. In 1988, Gheorghe Postică defended a Candidate's thesis under the direction of the specialist in Southern Siberia Leonid Kyzlasov, entitled "Early Medieval Ceramics in Central Moldavia from the End of the First Millennium to the Beginning of the Second Millennium A.D. as a Historical Source." For a bibliography of his works up to 2004, see: *Gheorghe Postică: bibliografie la 50 de ani*, ed. Zinaida Sochircă (Chişinău: Universitatea Libera Internațională din Moldova, 2004).

126 Postică, "Glinyanye kotly na territorii Moldavii v rannesrednevekovyy period," 238.

127 Idem, *Civilizația medievală timpurie din spațiul pruto-nistean (secolele V-XIII)*, 475.

of nomads among the region's population ("the groups of barrow cemeteries occupy an expanse that does not exceed one fifth of the Prut-Dniester area"<sup>128</sup>), Postică divides all known burials into not only chronological, but also territorial groups (lower Dniester – 40.4 percent of the burials, middle Dniester – 15.1 percent, Budjak – 36.3 percent, middle Prut – 8.2 percent).<sup>129</sup> Burials attributed by scholars to the 10th- to 12th-century nomads (Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans) have been uncovered in the vicinity of 100 villages and towns in the region. In Postică's view, the sites of Hansca, Molești, Durlești-Valea, Babei, Etulia, Shabo, and Bahate allow us to trace the progress of the nomads' gradual sedentarization.<sup>130</sup>

Large-scale excavations in the region became rare after the early 1990s, as the construction of great infrastructural projects took a near-fatal hit with the disintegration of the USSR. After 1991, some of the most extensive excavations that could produce medieval nomadic burials have been those on a cluster of kurgans near the town of Slobozia and the village of Hlinaia (Slobozia Subdistrict), as well as in the vicinity of the town of Camenca and the surrounding countryside.<sup>131</sup> Some discoveries were accidental – a burial of four medieval nomads was chanced on near the village of Dojbany-2 (Dubossary District) by the local prosecutor's office in the course of routine

128 Ibid., 475. Postică had previously singled out fourteen "massifs" of farmers' settlements, where he saw signs of a "continuity of living during the 5th to 13th centuries": Idem, "Structuri teritoriale medievale timpurii în spațiul Pruto-Nistrean," *Revista Arheologică* 1 (2005), no. 2, 212–36.

129 Idem, *Civilizația medievală timpurie din spațiul pruto-nistrean (secolele V-XIII)*, 448–460, 475, Maps 47–48.

130 Interestingly, in grouping nomadic burials chronologically, Postică relies on the conclusions of the authors who published the finds, without analyzing each burial independently. Considering that his dates are thus rooted in a variety of methodological approaches, the proportions of burials of different periods may be subject to doubt. Furthermore, if we consider that his arguments as to the length of each nomadic people's presence in the region are based on the number of burials attributed to it, these arguments also may lack a firm foundation. Victor Spinei chose a different path – he closely analyzed the publications of burials, not "trusting" the conclusions of the archaeologists who excavated them or published the materials: Spinei, *The Romanians and the Turkic Nomads*, 293–5. For a different approach to the analysis of nomadic burials of the 10th to 13th centuries in the region, see the works of Adrian Ioniță, who employed formal statistical methods: Ioniță, "Observații asupra mormintelor"; Idem, "Observations sur les necropoles planes dans la region comprise entre le Bas-Danube, les Carpates et le Dniestr aux Xe-XIIIe siecles."

131 Igor' V. Manzura, Evgeniï O. Klochko and Evgeniï N. Savva, *Kamenskiye kurgany* (Chișinău: Știința, 1992).

forensic work.<sup>132</sup> Stand-alone nomadic burials are being discovered almost every year.<sup>133</sup>

Along with changes in the scale of archaeological excavations, ideological shifts have taken place in Ukrainian and Moldovan historical scholarship. Taking its cue from Romanian historiography, with its interest primarily in the material culture of the Roman population in the lands of future Moldavia, contemporary Moldovan archaeology concerns itself relatively little with medieval nomadic burials.<sup>134</sup> Ukrainian historical scholarship, in its turn, has shifted its focus toward the history of the Ukrainian people and state-building.<sup>135</sup>

Perhaps the largest center of research on the region's medieval nomads today is the High Anthropological School (HAS) in Chişinău, created in 1998.<sup>136</sup> The HAS sponsors such programs as "Turkey-Moldavia: Without Conquerors and Conquered" and "The Discovery of Bulgaria."<sup>137</sup> These programs involve fieldwork on medieval (including nomadic) sites, ethnographic expeditions, seminars on the Turkic factor in the history of the Republic of Moldova, and the publication of research materials. The periodical *Stratum Plus*, published by the HAS, features papers on archaeology and numismatics shedding light on the events of the 9th to 13th century in the Dniester-Balkan region, including those that involved the nomads of the North Pontic steppes and Byzantium.

The more angles we find from which to analyze an archaeological site, the more valuable the outcome of the analysis. In the interpretation of

132 Nikolai Telnov, Ivan Chetverikov and Vitalii Sinica, "Polevyie issledovaniya u s. Doyban'-2 Dubessarskogo rayona v 2007 g.," *Revista Arheologică* 4 (2008), no. 1, 86.

133 See, for instance, Sergiu Popovici and Ion Ceban, "Cercetările de salvare din situl Cuncea-Prişansaia Gora din 2012. Rezultate Preliminare," *Arheologia preventivă în Republica Moldova* 1 (2014), no. 1–2, 33, Fig. 5; Vasiliu Haheu and Sergiu Popovici, "Raskopki kurganov k s. Zhyurzhyulesht' v Nizhnem Poprut'ye," *Revista Arheologică* 6 (2010), 132. In Gh. Postică's view, since around 4,500 kurgans are known in the Prut-Dniester region and at least in every second kurgan medieval nomadic burials are found, no less than 2,000 such burials should exist, which means that most of them still await their explorers: Postică, *Civilizația medievală timpurie din spațiul pruto-nistean (secolele V-XIII)*, 27.

134 Moldovan historiography today certainly subscribes to the dichotomy between *autochthons* and *aliens*, or *sedentary peoples* and *nomadic peoples* respectively – see, for instance, *ibid.*, 472.

135 According to Andrii Dobrolyubskii, the editorial board of the *Ukrayins'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal* (Ukrainian Historical Journal), Ukraine's flagship historical periodical, once refused to accept an article by Anatolii Bachynskii on the Nogai Horde, on the grounds that the Nogais ... were not Ukrainians: Dobrolyubskii, *Odesseye odnogo arkheologa*, 175.

136 In 2015, the High Anthropological School temporarily closed for restructuring.

137 The project "Turtsiya – Moldova: bez zavoyevannykh i zavoyevateley." Available at <https://bit.ly/3zCG4cU>. Accessed on 10 January 2022. The project "Otkrytiye Bolgarii." Available at <https://bit.ly/3Gd8BZ5>. Accessed on 10 January 2022.

archaeological materials, the special historical disciplines, particularly paleo-anthropology and numismatics, play an important part. The leading specialist in the paleoanthropology of the Prut-Dniester region is Marina Velikanova.<sup>138</sup> In her studies of the area's 10th- and 11th-century population, she draws on the materials from the burial fields at Brănești (near the village of Brănești, Orhei District, RM) and Limbari-Căprăria (Hansca, Ialoveni District, RM). The latter of the two, explored in 1960–65,<sup>139</sup> gave researchers reasons to speak of a symbiosis between the local population and nomads in the lands between the Prut and Dniester.<sup>140</sup>

As a number of Romanian archaeological studies showed in the second half of the 20th century, numismatic materials have a non-trivial significance as sources for the history of relations between Byzantium and the nomads of the North Pontic steppe. The way Bulgarian and Romanian scholars use numismatic finds in the study of Pecheneg, Uz, and Cuman raids on Byzantium in the 10th and 11th centuries is defined by the fact that such finds mostly come from the cultural layers of Byzantine cities or fortified settlements. This allows scholars

138 Marina S. Velikanova, *Paleoantropologiya Prutsko-Dnestrovskogo mezhdurech'ya* (Moscow: Nauka, 1975); Eadem, "Dannyye paleoantropologii o peremeshchenii naseleniya v Dnestrovsko-prutskom mezhdurech'ye v I–II tysyacheletiyakh"; Eadem, "Itogi i perspektivy paleoantropologicheskikh issledovaniy v Dnestrovsko-Prutskom mezhdurech'ye," in *Slavyano-moldavskiye svyazi i ranniye etapy etnicheskoy istorii moldavan*, 20–30; Fyodorov, Chebotarenko and Velikanova, *Braneshtskiy mogilnik X–XI vv.*; Marina S. Velikanova, *Antropologiya srednevekovogo naseleniya Moldavii: po materialam pamyatnika Staryy Orkhey* (Moscow: Institut etnologii i antropologii RAN, 1993).

139 The archaeological complex near the village of Hansca was discovered in 1959 by Lazar' Polevoi and Isak Rafalovich. Traces of fifteen archaeological cultures were detected, from Cucuteni-Trypillia to Moldavian cultures of the 17th and 18th centuries. Two medieval necropolises were found within the boundaries of Hansca – Limbari and Căprăria.

140 Velikanova, *Paleoantropologiya Prutsko-Dnestrovskogo mezhdurech'ya*, 114, 127–8. According to Ljudmila Doncheva-Petkova, 75 burials in the grave field of Căprăria in Moldavia (Ivan G. Hâncu, *Kepreriya – pamyatnik kul'tury X–XII vv.* (Kishinev: Shtiintsa, 1973)) have the same traits as those at Odürtsi: *Odürtsi*, 2, 19. Some of the skulls from the necropolis at Limbari have signs of symbolic trepanation, which in Bulgarian historiography at the time was considered characteristic of the Proto-Bulgarians (see above). Scholars have argued in favor of the Pecheneg (*Odürtsi*, 2, 53) or mixed "Hungaro-Turkic" origin of these burials (Evgenii Yu. Zvieriev and Konstantin T. Tkachuk, "K voprosu o periodizatsii mogil'nikov Kepreriya, Limbar' i Braneshht' v Pruto-Dnestrovskom mezhdurech'ye," *Stratum plus* (2012), no. 5, 147). The "Hungarian component" of the necropolises of Brănești, Limbari, and Căprăria has been highlighted by Svetlana Ryabtseva and Roman Rabinovich: Svetlana S. Ryabtseva and Roman A. Rabinovich, "O vozmozhnosti vydeleniya vengerskikh drevnostey v Karpato-Dnestrovskom regione v IX–X vv.," in *Rus' v IX–XII vekakh: obshchestvo, gosudarstvo, kul'tura*, eds. Nikolai A. Makarov and Andrei E. Leontiev (Moscow/Vologda: Drevnosti Severa, 2014), 263–79.

to date events mentioned in the written sources, determine the directions of nomadic attacks, and the like. There are almost no such Byzantine settlements along the Ukrainian section of the Lower Danube (the left bank of the Chilia branch),<sup>141</sup> or at least none have yet been discovered. However, the chronological distribution of numismatic materials in the Dniester-Prut-Danube region, their spread, metal content, and other factors can help assess the intensity of contacts between the local nomads and the Byzantine Empire.

For a long time, the finds of Byzantine coins along the Soviet Danube and between the Prut and Dniester did not have a student of their own. Vladislav Kropotkin (1922–93)<sup>142</sup> published general overviews of the discoveries of Byzantine coins in the USSR.<sup>143</sup> A number of individual finds and hoards were described in the works of Petro Karyshkovskii,<sup>144</sup> Avram Nudelman,<sup>145</sup> Rima Bondar and Svitlana Bulatovich,<sup>146</sup> and Olena Stolyaryk.<sup>147</sup> Avram Nudelman's monograph *Sketches in the History of Monetary Circulation in the Dniester-Prut*

- 
- 141 A possible exception is Kamyana Hora (Rock Hill tract) near the village of Orlovka (Bolhrad District, Odessa Region), where remains of a fortress dating to the Roman era were found, as well as a considerable quantity of Roman and Byzantine coins: Anna V. Ivanchenko, "R.D. Bondar yak doslidnytsya Orlovky" in *Libra: zbirka naukovykh prats' kafedry istoriyi starodavn'oho svitu ta serednikh viktiv*, ed. Iryna V. Niemchenko (Odessa: Odes'kyy natsional'nyy universytet imeni I.I. Mechnykova, 2012), 85–92.
- 142 About him: Igor S. Piore, "Use tvorche zhyttya – nautsi arkeolohiyi (Pam'yati V.V. Kropotkina)," *Arkheolohiya* (2002), no. 4, 147–52.
- 143 Vladislav V. Kropotkin, *Klady vizantiyskikh monet na territorii SSSR* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1962); Idem, "Novyye nakhodki vizantiyskikh monet na territorii SSSR," *VizVrem* 26 (1965), 166–89.
- 144 Petro O. Karyshkovskii, "Nakhodki antichnykh i vizantiyskikh monet v Odesskoy oblasti," in *Materialy z arkeolohiyi Pivnichnoho Prychornomor'ya*, 7 (Odessa: Odes'kyy derzhavnyy arkeolohichnyy muzey, 1971), 78–86; Idem, "Nakhodki antichnykh i vizantiyskikh monet v Odesskoy oblasti," in *Arkheologicheskiye i arkheograficheskiye issledovaniya na territorii Yuzhnoy Ukrainy*, ed. Zaira V. Pershina (Kyiv/Odessa: Vyshcha shkola, 1976), 172–7.
- 145 Avram A. Nudelman, "Nekotoryye nablyudeniya nad nakhodkami vizantiyskikh monet v Karpato-Dnestrovskom regione. (Obshchiye zakonomernosti i lokal'nyye osobennosti pronikoveniya)," in *Arkheologicheskiye issledovaniya v Moldavii v 1977-1978 gg.*, ed. Pavel Byrnâ (Kishinev: Shtiintsa, 1982), 27–53; Idem, "Monety iz raskopok i sborov 1972–1973 gg.," in *Arkheologicheskiye issledovaniya v Moldavii (1973 g.)*, ed. Vsevolod I. Markevich (Kishinev: Shtiintsa, 1974), 194–5; Idem, *Topografiya kladov i nakhodok yedinichnykh monet* (Kishinev: Shtiintsa, 1976).
- 146 Rima D. Bondar and Svitlana A. Bulatovich, "K nakhodkam vizantiyskikh monet v Orlovke," in *Severnoye Prichernomor'ye (materialy po arkheologii)*, ed. Leonid Subbotin (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1984), 145–8.
- 147 Olena S. Stolyaryk, "Klad monet imperatora Nikifora III Votaniata iz s. Făurești"; Eadem, "Novyye nakhodki pozdnerimskikh i vizantiyskikh monet v Pruto-Dnestrovskom mezhdurech'ye," in *Dnestro-Dunayskoye mezhdurech'ye v I–nachale II tysyacheletiya n.e.*, eds. Alla T. Smilenko et al. (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1987), 93–7; Eadem, *Ocherki monetnogo*

*Region*,<sup>148</sup> in which he attempted an overarching interpretation of the numismatic materials discovered in the area, came out in 1985.<sup>149</sup>

As Nudelman himself stated,<sup>150</sup> his book was greatly influenced by Isak Rafalovich's (1929–79) classic 1975 article on the topography of the discoveries of Byzantine coins and Byzantine imports in the region. Observing that half of all the mapped finds came from the immediate vicinity of the Lower Danube, Rafalovich concluded that they represented evidence of Slavic-Byzantine contacts.<sup>151</sup>

As for the small number of coins turning up on sites of medieval settlements, in Nudelman's view, this phenomenon "does not give grounds for any conclusions concerning the ethnic and cultural provenance of the finds of Byzantine coins."<sup>152</sup> In fact, this statement is less an attempt to avoid identifying the participants in the monetary circulation of that period than an effort to justify his own and Rafalovich's idea that those participants were Slavs.

Certainly, a Byzantine coin found out of archaeological context, such as a nomadic burial or the cultural layer of a permanent settlement, tells us nothing about its "owner." However, we should keep in mind that certain circumstances, for example the time when the coinless period ended in the region, or the appearance of gold coins in larger numbers starting in the 11th century,

---

*obrashcheniya Severo-Zapadnogo Prichernomor'ya v pozdnerimskoye i vizantiyskoye vremya (konets III–nachalo XIII v.)* (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1992).

148 Avaram A. Nudelman, *Ocherki istorii monetnogo obrashcheniya v Dnestrovsko-Prutskom regione (s drevneyshikh vremen do obrazovaniya feodal'nogo moldavskogo gosudarstva)* (Kishinev: Shtiintsa, 1985).

149 Sergiu Musteață is the author of the latest monograph on Byzantine coins in the region (Sergiu Musteață, *Moneda bizantină în regiunile carpato-nistrene în secolele V-X* (Chișinău: Editura ARC, 2014)).

150 *Ibid.*, 60.

151 Isak A. Rafalovich, "K voprosu o stepeni vliyaniya Vizantii na material'nyu kul'turu naseleniya Karpato-Dnestrovskikh zemel' v VI-IX vv.," in *Karpato-Dunayskiye zemli v sredniye veka*, ed. Yakim S. Grosul (Kishinev: Shtiintsa, 1975), 9. Overall, by the mid-1980s 331 Byzantine coins had been found in the Prut-Carpathian region, including 132 dating to the period from the early 9th to late 11th century. Only 1.2 percent of the total could be connected to settlements. While in the 10th century it was mostly copper coins that found their way into the region, in the 11th century gold coins appeared in significant numbers as well. As for the Dniester-Prut interfluvium, 327 Byzantine coins were found there in 63 locations, 87 of them dating from the late 9th to late 12th centuries. On six settlement sites, only 12 coins were found – that is, 3.7 percent of the total. Settlements with coin finds constitute only 2.12 percent of all 6th- to 12th-century settlements known in the region. 20 coins were found in seven burials as part of the inventory.

152 Nudelman, *Ocherki istorii monetnogo obrashcheniya v Dnestrovsko-Prutskom regione*, 67–81, 83.



could be evidence of the North Pontic nomads' close contacts with the country where these coins were minted.<sup>153</sup>

In 1995, the Russian historian Sergeĭ Travkin defended a Candidate's thesis on monetary circulation in medieval Bessarabia.<sup>154</sup> In his view, any conclusions regarding monetary exchange along the middle and lower course of the Dniester can be drawn only on the basis of so-called closed finds – that is, coins discovered as part of hoards or at archaeological sites.<sup>155</sup> Having analyzed over 100 Byzantine coins found in the region and dating from the 10th to 14th centuries, Travkin identified four phases in their circulation: 1) early 10th to late 11th centuries; 2) turn of the 12th to early 13th centuries; 3) 13th century; 4) 14th century.<sup>156</sup> The first of these periods coincides approximately with the period of Pecheneg presence in the region.

The problem of connecting the finds of Byzantine coins of the 10th and 11th centuries in the area with Pecheneg, Turk, and Cuman invasions and raids into the Byzantine territory requires a special study. One promising strategy might be to correlate written-source reports about the empire paying tribute or allowance to nomads for participation in military campaigns on Constantinople's side, as well as about other events potentially implying the acquisition of Byzantine currency by the trans-Danubian Turks, with the chronological and

153 On the role of gold in medieval Turkic culture, see: Alexandr G. Yurchenko, "Klyatva na zolote: tyurkskiy vklad v mongol'skuyu diplomatiyu," in *Tyurkologicheskiy sbornik 2007-2008: istoriya i kul'tura tyurkskikh narodov Rossii i sopredel'nykh stran*, ed. Sergeĭ G. Klyashtornyi (Moscow: Vostochnaya literatura, 2009), 410–23.

154 Sergeĭ Travkin, *Monety na territorii Bessarabii v epokhu srednevekov'ya* [Iz istorii denezhnogo obrashcheniya Yugo-Vostochnoy Yevropy] [Candidate's thesis] (Saint Petersburg, 1995).

155 Idem, "Vizantiyskiye monety X–XIV vv. i nekotoryye voprosy arkhelogicheskoy khronologii na Srednem i Nizhnem Dnestre," *Stratum plus* (2005–2009), no. 6, 371. In the foreseeable future, numismatic research may have to rely on old finds and discoveries made during archaeological excavations, because of the legal changes that have taken place in the antiquities market in Eastern Europe. After 1991, trade in precious metals and antiques was de-criminalized in Ukraine, Russia, and the Republic of Moldova, which was one of the main factors behind the current boom in illegal archaeology. For instance, more than two million metal detectors were sold in Russia in 2011 alone (*Moskovskiy komsomolets* [the newspaper], 15.01.2013, №26137). Ancient and medieval coins, seals, and jewelry are freely bought and sold on internet auctions, and the provenance of all these finds remains unknown.

156 Travkin, "Vizantiyskiye monety X–XIV vv.," 371–3. However, his grouping together of the finds not only from Romania and Moldavia, but also from Right-Bank Ukraine (including Kyiv) and the mouth of the Dnieper seems puzzling (pp. 371–2).

territorial distribution of numismatic discoveries across the steppes of the left bank of the Danube from the Tisza to the Chilia branch.<sup>157</sup>

### 1.3 *The Pechenegs and the North Crimean Canal: Exploring Nomadic Archaeological Remains in Crimea*

Historians and archaeologists specializing in medieval Crimea have always had to deal with a discrepancy between the testimony of the written sources and archaeological materials. According to the *De Administrando Imperio*, “Patzinacia ... to Cherson is very near, and to Bosphorus closer still,”<sup>158</sup> that is, the land of the Pechenegs extended across the entire span of the Crimean steppe. However, if Byzantine remains literally lay scattered on the ground, evidence of Pecheneg and Cuman presence was not easy to come by.<sup>159</sup> Archaeologists studying Crimea had more attractive subjects to work with, such as the remnants of ancient and medieval cities and Scythian-era sites.

The most serious problems confronting the archaeology of the Crimean steppe are, and have been for a long time, the broad scale of agricultural cultivation, intensive land use, and activities of illegal archaeologists.<sup>160</sup> Just within the first two or three decades of the 20th century, the average height of the peninsula’s kurgans shrank by 50 to 70 cm.<sup>161</sup> Despite the strict laws regulating the preservation of archaeological remains in the USSR, destruction of mass burials, including medieval, was a frequent occurrence.<sup>162</sup> The

157 For instance, Zhenya Zhekova believes that the Pechenegs may have received from Byzantium 475 kg of gold for their participation in the Battle of Acheloos: Zhekova, “Parichni plashtaniya na Vizantiya, svürzani s bitkata pri Akheloï,” 107–8.

158 Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De administrando imperio*, 1, 169.

159 As of 2016, 62 kurgan, ground, and crypt necropolises had been excavated in Crimea, producing 95 medieval nomadic burials dating from the 12th to 14th centuries. 10th- and 11th-century finds (the Pecheneg period) are much less numerous: Victor N. Chkhaidze, “Voyennaya organizatsiya kochevnikov Kryma v XII–XIV vekakh,” in *Dialog gorodskoy i stepnoy kul’tur na Yevraziyskom prostranstve. Istoricheskaya geografiya Zolotoy Ord. Materialy Sed’moy Mezhdunarodnoy konferentsii, posiyashchonnoy pamyati G.A. Fodorova-Davydova*, eds. Sergeï G. Bocharov and Ayrat G. Sitdikov (Kazan/Yalta/Chişinău: Stratum Plus, 2016), 302.

160 Alexandr V. Gavrilo, “Srednevekovyye pamyatniki Yugo-Vostochnogo Kryma (materialy k arkeologicheskoy karte),” in *Sugdeyskiy sbornik*, 3, eds. Nelya M. Kukoval’ska et al. (Kyiv/Sudak: Akadempriodyka, 2008), 382.

161 Sergeï G. Koltukhov, Vitalii L. Kolotukhin and Alexandr E. Kislyi, “O rabotakh Severo-Krymskoy ekspeditsii,” in *Arkheologicheskiye issledovaniya v Krymu (1993)*, eds. Vadim A. Kutaisov et al. (Simferopol: Tavriya, 1994), 162.

162 Askold A. Shchepinskiï, “Srednevekovyye pogrebeniya v gruntovykh mogilakh bliz Simferopolya,” in *Arkheologicheskiye issledovaniya srednevekovogo Kryma*, ed. Oleg I. Dombrovskii (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1968), 169, 179–80; Anton Lagutin, “Pogrebeniye

Russian Civil War in 1918–1920 and the fighting in Crimea in 1941 and 1944 did a lot of harm to its archaeological heritage. In particular, the unpublished reports on the excavations of medieval nomadic burials undertaken by Yulian Kulakovskii, Nikolaï Veselovskii, and Nikolaï Ernst were lost;<sup>163</sup> some archaeological sites suffered considerable damage.<sup>164</sup> Earlier still, thousands of stone statues erected by medieval nomads as funerary stelae were destroyed or removed for use as decorations on estates of the Russian nobility during the Russian colonization of Crimea and southern Ukraine in the late 18th and early 19th centuries.<sup>165</sup>

Aside from the incompleteness of the available archaeological and written evidence, there were other, ideological obstacles faced by researchers interested in medieval Byzantine Crimea and the North Azov steppe. In 1945, the Tauro-Scythian Expedition, headed by Pavel Schultz, began its work in the peninsula. In their publications, members of the expedition disputed the importance of Rome in Crimea's history and stressed the role of the local "Tauro-Scythian" population.<sup>166</sup> In 1952–55, Boris Rybakov directed an archaeological expedition on the Taman Peninsula with the express intention to search for traces of the Rus' in the area.<sup>167</sup> In 1952, at the height of the post-war chauvinist campaign, a conference of historians took place in Crimea, with the participation of Boris Grekov and Boris Rybakov. Both high-ranking scholars cautioned against "overstating" the role of the Goths, Khazars, Rome, Byzantium, the Pechenegs, Cumans, and the Genoese in the history of medieval

---

srednevekovogo kochevnika u sela Priberezhnoye v Severo-Zapadnom Krymu," *RosArkh* (1998), no. 3, 157.

163 Cherepanova and Shchepinskiĭ, "Pogrebeniia pozdних kochevnikov v stepnom Krymu," 181.

164 Valerii S. Olkhovskii, "Raskopki kurganov v Sakskom rayone Kryma," in *Arkheologicheskiye otkrytiia 1985 g.*, ed. Valentin P. Shilov (Moscow: Nauka, 1987), 383.

165 Svetlana A. Pletnyova, *Polovetskiye kamennyye izvyaniya* (Moscow: Nauka, 1974), 8.

166 See: Victor L. Myts, *Ukrepneniia Tavriki X–XV vv.* (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1991), 15–6.

167 For instance, remains of a medieval church were discovered, identified as the Church of St Mother of God, founded by Prince Mstislav Volodimirovich: Victor N. Chkhaidze, "Tamanskaya arkheologicheskaya ekspeditsiia 1952–1955 gg. pod rukovodstvom B.A. Rybakova," in *Trudy II (XVIII) Vserossiyskogo arkheologicheskogo s'yezda v Suzdale, 2008 g.*, vol. 3, eds. Natalii P. Derevyanko and Nikolai A. Makarov (Moscow: Institut Arkheologii RAN, 2008), 254. Pletnyova, who took part in Rybakov's expedition, stated in 2001 that finding this church was actually the main goal of the expedition. None of the materials from the excavation of approximately 800 square meters of ground near the church, including those indicating the presence of nomads, have been published: Svetlana A. Pletnyova, "Kochevniki v Tamatarkhe," *RosArkh* (2001), no. 2, 97.

Taurica. The study of the Slavic influence on the culture of the peninsula<sup>168</sup> and of ties between Rus' and Byzantium<sup>169</sup> was pronounced the essential mission of Soviet medieval studies as far as Crimea was concerned.

The two Academicians from the capital aimed their criticism at the works of Anatolii Yakobson.<sup>170</sup> Responding to the attack (which in those times could be a prelude to judicial persecution), Yakobson “admitted” that he had indeed been exaggerating the role of Byzantium in the history of Crimea. He suggested that both the “positive” aspects of the empire’s role (protecting the southern section of the peninsula from nomads) and the “negative” ones (for example, the burden of taxation imposed by the imperial government on Cherson) should be considered.<sup>171</sup> Generally, enthusiasm in the Soviet scholarly community for the study of the Slavs’ role in the life of the Crimean Peninsula ran so high that theories were put forward of their presence there since the 3rd century AD!<sup>172</sup> One way or another, all pottery that fit into the chronological boundaries of “Slavic history” was declared Slavic.<sup>173</sup>

168 “As early as 1948, owing to the deportation of the Tatars and other nationalities and the need to justify ideologically the importation of large numbers of Slavic settlers into the peninsula, the Sector of History and Archaeology of the Crimean Research Base of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR included into its work plans the topic ‘Slavs in Crimea’ (Alexandr V. Dzhanov, Vadym V. Mayko and Olexandr M. Farbei, “Mikhail Antonovich Frondzhulo 1914–1997 gg.,” in *Sugdeyskiy sbornik*, 4, ed. Nelya M. Kukoval’s’ka (Kyiv/Sudak: Akadempriodyka, 2010), 7.

169 On the history of the efforts to prove the “historicity” of Russia’s sovereignty over Crimea in Russian historiography since the 17th century, see: Vadym V. Khapayev, “Slavyanskaya diaspora v srednevekovom Krymu: k preodoleniyu istoriograficheskikh illyuziy,” in *Sugdeyskiy sbornik*, 3, 238–40.

170 Udaltsova, *Sovetskoye vizantinovedeniye za 50 let*, 129.

171 Ibid., 130; Anatolii L. Yakobson, “Vizantiya v istorii rannesrednevekovoy Tavriki,” *SovArkh* 21 (1954), 148–63.

172 Udaltsova, *Sovetskoye vizantinovedeniye za 50 let*, 129.

173 See, for instance, Vladimir P. Babenchikov, “Itogi issledovaniya srednevekovogo poseleniya na kholme Tepsen’,” in *Istoriya i arkheologiya srednevekovogo Kryma*, ed. Alexei P. Smirnov (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1958), 118. It was not just Soviet Russia’s Orientalist inheritance from Tsarist Russia that served as a breeding ground for this discourse. Recent events – the mass deportation of the Crimean Tatars and a number of other nationalities from Crimea, Krasnodar Krai, and Rostov Region in 1944 (see: Mykola O. Shulga, *Velikoye pereseleniye: repatrianty, bezhentsy, trudovyye migranty* (Kyiv: Instytut sotsiologii NAN Ukrainy, 2002), 117–8, 131–3.) and the renaming of Crimea’s towns, villages, mountains, and rivers whose names had Tatar, Greek, or German roots – played a significant role as well. In 1952, all railroad stations in the peninsula were renamed (Polyan, *Ne po svoey vole...*, 127). In 1944, the settlement of large numbers of “Slavs” began in different areas of the peninsula, depending on whether it was mandatory, partially mandatory, or a form of “reward.” (Polyan, *Ne po svoey vole...*, 135). Finally, the list of “ideological” issues that influenced the study of the archaeological

The first great postwar work on Crimean history was the monograph *Medieval Chersonesus, 12th to 14th Centuries* by Anatoliĭ Yakobson.<sup>174</sup> One cannot say that Yakobson ignored the nomadic factor in the history of Byzantine Cherson. On the contrary, he stressed the role of the Pechenegs and later Cumans as the city's trading partners, and eventually, in the case of the latter, as fatal competition.<sup>175</sup> However, there was nothing new the book could say on the problem of relations between Byzantium and the nomads of the North Pontic steppe, because in his treatment of it the author relied solely on the known written sources and the Russian historiographical tradition – the works of Vasiliĭ Tatishchev, Vasiliĭ Vasilievskiĭ, and Mikhail Priselkov.

In particular, the historical part of Yakobson's book was shaped by Priselkov's conception of a common struggle of Rus' and Byzantium against the Steppe as the underpinning of Russo-Byzantine relations.<sup>176</sup> His almost only "local" source of information about the Crimean nomads' relations with Cherson was an inscription from 1059 about the restoration of the city's walls.<sup>177</sup>

The second part of Yakobson's monograph came out in 1959, bearing noticeable marks of the above-mentioned conference of 1952 in its efforts to correct

---

record of 10th- to 11th-century nomads in Crimea and the North Azov steppe would not be complete without the "Khazar" factor. Because at various times the territories of Crimea and Northern Caucasus were part of the Khazar Khaganate or of its sphere of influence, taboos concerning the condition of the Jews in the USSR applied to the medieval history of Crimea and the Azov steppes. In the words of Kizilov and Mikhaylova, "following the deportation of the Crimean Tatars and many other ethnic minorities from their homelands to Siberia, Central Asia, and the Urals, the study of Turkic peoples and their languages became ideologically suspect and dangerous. The study of the Khazars, because of their conversion to Judaism, was even less welcome against the backdrop of 'the Doctors' Plot' and the struggle against Zionism and 'rootless cosmopolitanism.'" (Mikhail Kizilov and Diana Mikhaylova, "Khazary i Khazarskiy kaganat v yevropeyskikh natsionalisticheskikh ideologiyakh i politicheski oriyentirovannoy nauchno-issledovatel'skoy literature," *Khazarskiy al'manakh* 3 (2004), 51). See also: Victor Shnirelman, *The Myth of the Khazars and Intellectual Antisemitism in Russia, 1970s–1990s* (Jerusalem: Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2002). About "the Doctors' Plot," see: Jonathan Brent and Vladimir Naumov, *Stalin's Last Crime: The Plot Against the Jewish Doctors, 1948–1953* (New York: Harper Perennial, 2004). On Soviet historical scholarship in 1946–53, see also: Chris Ward, "What is History? The Case of Late Stalinism," in *Rethinking History: The Journal of Theory and Practice* 8 (2004), no. 3, 439–58.

174 Anatoliĭ L. Yakobson, *Srednevekovy Khersones (XII–XIV vv.)* (Moscow/Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1950).

175 *Ibid.*, 11–7, 24–6.

176 *Ibid.*, 17 and 20.

177 Furthermore, Yakobson's *Medieval Chersonesus* is not free of factual errors, such as the statement that the first Pecheneg raid on Byzantium took place in 1035: *Ibid.*, 17.

the author's earlier "mistakes."<sup>178</sup> The book is much less a work on the archaeology of the Byzantine city of Cherson than a study of Russo-Byzantine relations. The Pechenegs are mentioned as well, but their role in the history of the city is reduced to supplying the citizens with products of animal husbandry, and Cherson itself serves as a mediator in Constantinople's designs concerning the nomads.<sup>179</sup> In Yakobson's two other books, published in 1964 and 1973, any analysis of nomadic archaeological remains in Crimea is similarly absent.<sup>180</sup>

By the 1970s, new medieval "nomadic" materials were already available to scholars. In the aftermath of the Volga-Don Archaeological Expedition, there arose a new interest in the archaeological treasures of the Crimean steppe, especially in the remains of the Saltovo-Mayaki culture. The "search for the Slavs" in the history of Crimea was not abandoned (at least not completely) until the 1960s,<sup>181</sup> but relations between Rus', Crimea, and the Azov steppe have since remained a priority for the Soviet and post-Soviet historiography of the region.

In 1961, construction began on the North Crimean Canal, which would eventually run for 400 kilometers from the Kakhovka Reservoir to the city of Kerch. Branches were planned into 5 *rayons* (districts) of Crimea. According to the Soviet law regulating the preservation of archaeological remains, rescue excavations had to accompany projects of such scale. Accordingly, the so-called North-Crimean Expedition was launched.<sup>182</sup> Within just the first three years of its work along the northern coast of the Syvash (1962–64), the expedition excavated 28 kurgans, which contained over 500 chronologically diverse burials, including over 180 late medieval ones. The following three years yielded 57 kurgans. Of the burials discovered in 1962–64, six were attributed to the medieval nomads.<sup>183</sup> They were partially analyzed in an article by Konstantin Kogonashvili.<sup>184</sup> In the Kerch Peninsula, 80 kurgans were explored in 1960–67,

178 Anatolii L. Yakobson, *Rannesrednekovyy Khersones* (Moscow/Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1959).

179 *Ibid.*, 59–60, 53–6.

180 Anatolii L. Yakobson, *Srednekovyy Krym. Ocherki istorii i istorii material'noy kul'tury* (Moscow/Leningrad: Nauka, 1964); *Idem, Krym v sredniye veka* (Moscow: Nauka, 1973).

181 See, for instance, Mikhail A. Frondzhulo, "Raskopki srednekovogo poseleniya na okraine s. Planerskoye v 1957–1959 gg.," in *Arkheologicheskiye issledovaniya srednekovogo Kryma*, 132.

182 Askold A. Shchepinskiĭ and Yelena N. Cherepanova, *Drevnosti stepnogo Kryma. Severnoye Prisivash'ye v V–I tysyacheletiyakh do n.e.* (Simferopol: Izdatel'stvo "Krym," 1969), 4.

183 *Ibid.*, 294.

184 Konstantin K. Kogonashvili, "K voprosu o srednekovom naselenii Severnogo Kryma (po materialam arkheologicheskikh raskopok 1962–1964 gg.)," in *Drevnosti stepnogo Kryma. Severnoye Prisivash'ye v V–I tysyacheletiyakh do n.e.*, 299–321. See also:

with burials ranging from the Kemi-Oba culture to medieval nomads, but only materials from Scythian burials found their way into the scholarly literature.<sup>185</sup>

In 1968, Askold Shchepinskiĭ (1926–97) and Yelena Cherepanova (1935–72) published an article on “Burials of Late Nomads in the Crimean Steppe.”<sup>186</sup> This work not only summed up the authors’ excavations over the period from 1958 to 1972, but also made use of the materials discovered by Yu. Kulakovskii and N. Veselovskii back in the 19th century and by N. Ernst in 1924–30, all preserved in Simferopol’s Museum of local history. The study focused mostly on classifying various types of finds: bone artifacts, weapons (sabers, spearheads), and horse harness.<sup>187</sup>

While the construction of the North Crimean Canal and other hydro-technical projects made possible the discovery of many nomadic burials,<sup>188</sup> systematic and purposeful excavations were mostly confined to the Syvash coast, yielding relatively plentiful archaeological material. It was likely this that allowed Olexandr Aybabin to assert that, because 10th-century Pecheneg

---

Konstantin K. Kogonashvili, Olga A. Makhneva, “O novykh otkrytiyakh pogrebeniy srednevekovykh kochevnikov v kurganakh Kryma,” in *Uchenyye zapiski Sverdlovskogo pedagogicheskogo instituta i Tyumenskogo pedagogicheskogo instituta* 158 (1971), 113–6.

185 Eleonora V. Yakovenko, Yevgen V. Chernenko and Valentyna N. Korpusova, “Opisaniye skifskikh pogrebeniy v kurganakh Vostochnogo Kryma,” in *Drevnosti Vostochnogo Kryma: (predskifskiy period i skify)*, ed. A.M. Leskov (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1970), 136.

186 Cherepanova and Shchepinskiĭ, “Pogrebeniya pozdnykh kochevnikov v stepnom Krymu,” 181–201.

187 Describing 23 nomadic burials, the researchers noted that, in the Crimean Mountains and along the southern coast of the peninsula, kurgan burials of nomads are absent and most of the burials are inlet graves in older kurgans – Eneolithic, Bronze-Age, and Early Iron. They distinguished two types of graves: rectangular (overlaid with wood) and kerf pits – pits that end in a small cave (kerf), in which the body is deposited. The standard burial posture was supine, with arms and legs straight; bodies were more often oriented to the east (6 burials) and north-east (3 burials), and sometimes to the west or south-west (2 burials each). Horse remains were found in 17 graves (heads and legs in 13 graves, legless skeletons in 4), accompanied by iron stirrups and bridles, sometimes with bells, buttons, and beads. A few burials contained weapons: swords (5), sabers (7), spear- and arrowheads, knives, and even chain mails. As for the ethnic identity of the finds, the authors deferred judgment: the materials from most of these burials had been lost, and therefore it would have been very difficult to date them or determine their “ethnicity.” Overall, most of the burials could be dated from the 9th to 11th century: Cherepanova and Shchepinskiĭ, “Pogrebeniya pozdnykh kochevnikov v stepnom Krymu,” 200–201. If we take into account Ivanov’s and Garustovich’s latest research on the identification of Pecheneg burials, including those without inventory, we can justifiably doubt Cherepanova’s and Shchepinskiĭ’s conclusions regarding the ethnic attribution of these 23 burials.

188 Valerii S. Olkhovskii and Vitalii V. Otroshchenko, “Kurgannoye svyatilishche epokhi bronzy v Krymu,” in *Drevnosti stepnogo Prichernomor’ya i Kryma*, 2, eds. Gennadii N. Toshchev et al. (Zaporizhia, 1991), 111.

graves occur only on the Syvash coast, these nomads' presence in the interior of the Crimean steppe was intermittent and short-lived.<sup>189</sup>

If excavations on a scale similar to those along the Syvash and in the south of Crimea<sup>190</sup> had been undertaken across the entire peninsula, the map of medieval nomadic burials would probably look different now. During the 1980s, nomadic burials began to be uncovered not only on the Syvash coast, but also in the kurgans of the central and western parts of the Crimean steppe.<sup>191</sup> However, historians have had very little use for them.<sup>192</sup>

Artifacts from the excavations of medieval nomadic burials in Crimea undertaken in the 19th and first half of the 20th century, such as the bridle set that Nikolai Veselovskii found in Saraylı Qıyat in 1892, are also only sporadically available to scholars.<sup>193</sup>

- 
- 189 Olexandr I. Aybabin, "Peceneghi e Polovcy in Crimea," in *Dal Mille al Mille. Tesorie popoli dal Mar Nero*, eds. Ermanno A. Arslan and Carola Della Porta (Milan: Mondadori Electa, 1995), 211; Idem, *Etnicheskaya istoriya rannevizantiyskogo Kryma* (Simferopol: Dar, 1999), 227; Idem, "General Background to the Collection," in *The Berthier-Delagarde Collection of Crimean Jewelry in the British Museum and Related Material*, eds. Dafydd Kidd and Barry Ager (Research Publication no.166) (London: British Museum Press, 2008), 6.
- 190 Notably, aside from the Crimean steppe, nomadic burials continue to be found in Cherson and Sugdaea, well-studied archaeologically: Olexandr I. Aybabin, "Step' i Yugo-Zapadnyy Krym," in *Krym, Severo-Vostochnoye Prichernomor'ye i Zakavkaz'ye v epokhu srednevekov'ya (IV–XIII veka)*, eds. Tatyana I. Makarova and Svetlana A. Pletnyova (Moscow: Nauka, 2003), 81; Vadym V. Mayko, Olexandr V. Dzhanov and Olexandr M. Farbei, "Arkheologicheskiye issledovaniya blizhayshey okrugy Sugdei v 2007–2008 gg.," *Arkheolohichni doslidzhennya v Ukrayini* (2008), 196.
- 191 Sergei G. Koltukhov, Alexandr E. Kislyi and Gennadii N. Toshchev, *Kurgannyye drevnosti Kryma. (Po materialam raskopok Severo-Krymskoy ekspeditsii 1991-1992 gg.)*, vol. 1 (Zaporizhia, 1994), 115.
- 192 For instance, in 1982 archaeologists found a kurgan in the village of Quyu (Romashkine, Saky District) with a rich grave that they dated between the 10th and 12th centuries. The grave belonged to a woman and child, with the assemblage including horse limbs, iron stirrups, a girth buckle, a knife, necklaces of glass, amber, and mother-of-pearl, beads of small river pearls, one amber and several coral pendants, two bronze finger rings, bronze headwear plaques coated with golden foil, and fragments of a chainlet woven from silver thread (Valerii S. Olkhovskii, "Issledovaniya v Sakskom rayone Kryma," in *Arkheologicheskiye otkrytiya 1982 g.*, ed. Boris A. Rybakov (Moscow: Nauka, 1984), 309). It is hard to say today what those objects looked like, because their drawings were never published and we do not know where they are now, or if they have survived at all. Thus, it is difficult to pinpoint the "ethnicity" of this grave with any certainty and connect it with the Pechenegs, Oghuzes, Cumans, or Tatars.
- 193 "Proizvodstvo arkheologicheskikh raskopok" v Tavrisheskoy gubernii," in *Otchet Imperatorskoy Arkheologicheskoy Komissii za 1892 god*" (Saint Petersburg: Tipografiya glavnogo upravleniya udelov, 1894), 6–7; Anatolii N. Kirpichnikov, *Snaryazheniye vsadnika i verkhovogo konya na Rusi IX–XIII vekov*, 26–9, Image 62.



Materials from the nomadic burials of the 10th to 12th centuries explored in the 1970s–1990s (excavations by Vladilen Anokhin, Igor Khrapunov, Valerii Olkhovskii, and others),<sup>194</sup> also have not been given proper attention in either scholarly periodicals or general overviews such as *The Archaeology of the Ukrainian SSR* or *The Steppes of Eurasia in the Middle Ages*.<sup>195</sup>

The 2003 collective monograph *Crimea, the Northeastern Pontic Region, and Transcaucasia in the Middle Ages* included an essay by the Ukrainian archaeologist Olexandr Aybabin on “The Steppe and Southwestern Crimea,” in which he summed up the results of the archaeological study of Pecheneg, Uz, and Cuman material remains in the peninsula. Aybabin based his conclusions mainly on the above-mentioned article by Cherepanova and Shchepinskiĭ. In the same year, he also published an overview of the Cuman burials in Crimea.<sup>196</sup> Another summary of the archaeological relics of the 10th- to 13th-century steppe dwellers in Crimea was produced by Leonid Ponomaryov.<sup>197</sup>

Regrettably, despite the almost century-long history of the archaeological exploration of 10th- and 11-century nomadic burials in Crimea, we still lack a study that would consider the results of the many decades of excavations in light of the most recent research on the ethnic attribution of Pecheneg, Uz, and Cuman burials based on their ritual and grave inventory. In their attempts to date burials, archaeologists of the second half of the 20th century

- 
- 194 Olexandr I. Aybabin, “Step’ i Yugo-Zapadny Krym,” 74; Iryna O. Molodchukova, “Zhenskiye polovetskiye pogrebeniia iz stepnogo Kryma,” in *Arkheologicheskiye issledovaniia na Ukraine v 1978–1979 gg. Tezisy dokladov XVIII konferentsii Instituta arkheologii AN USSR* (Dnipropetrovsk, 1980), 163–4; Valerii S. Olkhovskii, “Issledovaniia v Sakskom rayone Kryma,” pp. 308–309; Vadim A. Kutaysov, “Materialy k arkheologicheskoy karte Severo-Zapadnogo Kryma XI–XV vv.,” in *Istoricheskoye nasledie Kryma* 9 (2005), 57–61; Koltukhov, Kislyĭ and Toshchev, *Kurgannyye drevnosti Kryma*, 114; Lagutin, “Pogrebeniie srednevekovogo kochevnika u sela Priberezhnoye v Severo-Zapadnom Krymu.”
- 195 Oleg I. Dombrovskii, “Srednekovyy Krym X–XV v.,” in *Arkheologiya Ukrainy SSR*, vol. 3, eds. Volodymyr D. Baran et al. (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986), 518–35; Svetlana A. Pletnyova, “Pechenegi, torki, polovtsy,” in *Stepi Yevrazii v epokhu srednekov’ya*, 213–22; Alexandr N. Shcheglov, “Raskopki i razvedki v Severo-Zapadnom Krymu,” *Arkheologicheskiye otkrytiia 1982 g.*, 345–6.
- 196 Olexandr I. Aybabin, “Goroda i stepi Kryma v XIII–XIV vv. po arkheologicheskim svidetel’stvam,” *MAIET* 10 (2003), 277–307, Map. 1. Corrections to the map were proposed by Emil Seydaliev in: Emil Seydaliev, “Srednekovoye pogrebeniie iz Tavel’skogo kurgana №5 u s. Krasnoles’ye,” *MAIET* 15 (2009), 377–88.
- 197 Leonid Yu. Ponomaryov, “Stepi Kerchenskogo poluostrova vo vtoroy polovine X–XIII vv.,” in *Bospor Kimmeriyskiy i varvarskiy mir v period antichnosti i srednekov’ya. Arkheologicheskii ob’ekt v kontekste istorii. XIV Bosporskiye chteniya*, ed. Victor N. Zin’ko (Kerch, 2013), 384–91.

often showed little familiarity with the historiography of the problem. Dating was often rather vague; scholars resorted to the term “late-nomadic,” which lumped graves of the Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans of the 9th to 13th centuries into one chronological group. The main reasons for this were the absence of inventory and the poor preservation of graves, which were often robbed or ploughed over.

For Russian and Soviet historiography, the nomads of the 9th to 13th centuries were an alien power. The “archaeology of Rus” and “archaeology of the Steppe” existed separately. That is why in most cases the archaeological study of medieval nomadic remains was limited to burials. Signs of devastation in cultural layers of sedentary towns and villages were another manifestation of nomadic presence.

Archaeological materials from the middle and second half of the 10th century in the peninsula reveal a mass destruction of settlements.<sup>198</sup> Until that time, medieval Crimea’s population density was extremely high (more than 100 settlements are known). Similar events took place on the Lower Don and the Taman Peninsula.<sup>199</sup> The common view is that in the mid-10th century a new archaeological culture overtook the Saltovo-Mayaki culture in Crimea.<sup>200</sup> Anatoliĭ Yakobson, Alexandr Gadlo, Svetlana Pletnyova, Alla Romanchuk, Mikhail Frondzhulo, David Talis, Tatyana Makarova, and Constantin Zuckerman interpret this cataclysm as a Pecheneg invasion.<sup>201</sup> Igor’ Baranov sees it as a consequence of Byzantium’s renewed efforts to restore its authority in Taurica.<sup>202</sup> Aside from a Pecheneg invasion, among other possible factors scholars name the campaigns of the princes Sviatoslav and Volodimir known from the written sources, natural disasters, and punitive expeditions by the

198 Igor A. Baranov, *Tavrika v epokhu rannego srednevekov’ya (saltovo-mayatskaya kul’tura)* (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1990), 152–3.

199 Vadym V. Mayko, “Arkheologicheskaya situatsiya v srednevekovoy Tavrike i na Tamani v seredine X v. (k voprosu o vremeni smeny arkheologicheskikh kul’tur),” *Khazarskiy al’manakh* 10 (2012), 108–10.

200 Igor A. Baranov and Vadym V. Mayko, “Vizantiyskiye monety serediny X v. iz Sugdei,” *Stratum plus* (1999), no. 6, 129.

201 See: Vadym V. Mayko, *Srednevekovoye gorodishche na plato Tepsen’ v yugovostochnom Krymu* (Kyiv: Akademperiodyka, 2004), 29–45; Leonid Yu. Ponomaryov, “Saltovo-mayatskiye poseleniya Kerchenskogo poluostrova (arkheologicheskiye istochniki),” *Khazarskiy al’manakh* 12 (2014), 151; Idem, “Stepi Kerchenskogo poluostrova vo vtoroy polovine X–XIII vv.”

202 Baranov, *Tavrika v epokhu rannego srednevekov’ya (saltovo-mayatskaya kul’tura)*, 152–3.

Magyars, Alans, or Khazars.<sup>203</sup> Nomadic activity is widely seen as the cause of the disappearance of Saltovo-Mayaki settlements not only in Crimea, but also in the steppes of mainland Ukraine, particularly on the Middle Siverskyi Donets.<sup>204</sup>

Victor Myts argues that in the 10th century the Byzantine administration restored the fortresses and the system of long walls in the mountain passes of southwestern Crimea to defend the region, not so much against an army with siege skills, as against nomads, evidently the Pechenegs. Remnants of weapons have been found near these fortifications, as well as traces of fires and destruction. The main purpose of such defensive works was not to withstand a long siege, but rather to guard against surprise attacks by nomads and allow the civilian population to wait out disaster.<sup>205</sup> During this period, around 30 new fortresses appeared in Crimea, together with cattle pens and early warning posts. Walls were built around many monasteries.<sup>206</sup> Oleg Dombrovskii (1914–94) writes that, because of repeated Pecheneg raids, a mass relocation of the population of Taurica into the better-protected mountain areas took place. We can detect this phenomenon in the deterioration of plough agriculture. Cereals began to be grown on mountain terraces, dairy products became central to the population's diet, mountain pastures came into use, and transhumant pastoralism reappeared, after a very long decline since the times of the Tauri.<sup>207</sup>

203 Vadym V. Khapayev, "Razrusheniye Khersonesa na rubezhe X–XI vv.: k izucheniyu prichin," in *Bakhchisarayskiy istoriko-arkheologicheskiy sbornik*, 3, eds. Yurii M. Mogarychev and Igor N. Khrapunov (Simferopol: Antikva, 2008), 157; Valerii E. Naumenko, "Nekotoryye klyuchevyye voprosy istorii Tavriki X–XI vv.," *Antichnaya drevnost' i sredniye veka* 40 (2011), 177 and 183; Vadym V. Mayko, *Srednevekovoye gorodishche na plato Tepsen' v yugovostochnom Krymu*, 33–7.

204 Eduard E. Kravchenko, "Poseleniya khazarskogo vremeni (Severo-Vostochnoye Priazov'ye, Donetskiy Kryazh, Stepnoye Podontsov'ye)," in *Arkheologicheskiy al'manakh* 30 (2013), 290; Eduard E. Kravchenko and Victor V. Davydenko, "Sidorovskoye gorodishche," *Stepi Yevropy v epokhu srednevekov'ya* 2 (2001), 250.

205 Myts, *Ukrepneniya Tavriki X–XV vv.*, 70–1. Fortifications were actively excavated in Crimea in 1979–89 (*Ibid.*, 82).

206 Oleg I. Dombrovskii, "Srednevekovyie poseleniya i 'Isary' Krymskogo Yuzhnoberezh'ya," in *Feodal'naya Tavrika. Materialy po istorii i arkheologii Kryma*, ed. Sergii M. Bibikov (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1974), 30; Myts, *Ukrepneniya Tavriki X–XV vv.*, 104.

207 Dombrovskii, "Srednevekovyie poseleniya i 'Isary' Krymskogo Yuzhnoberezh'ya," 17–8. However, it is not out of the question that the revival of transhumant pastoralism in the mountainous parts of Taurica could also have had something to do with the Pechenegs.

Marks of 10th-century destruction are evident at Aluston,<sup>208</sup> Partenit,<sup>209</sup> Cherson,<sup>210</sup> Mangup,<sup>211</sup> Sugdaea,<sup>212</sup> Baqla,<sup>213</sup> Oreanda-Isar,<sup>214</sup> and Panea (Ai-Panda, Simeiz).<sup>215</sup> Makarova argues that Bosporos switched allegiance from the Khazar Khaganate to Byzantium because of the city's destruction by a Pecheneg raid at the end of the 9th century.<sup>216</sup> A violent intrusion in the 10th century also led to the disappearance of numerous settlements north of the Sea of Azov and along the Don. There are traces of extensive burning at Tamatarcha as well.<sup>217</sup> Similarly to the Danube region, archaeologists find 10th- and 11th-century Byzantine coins in the cultural layers affected by fires. However, while for the 11th-century Lower Danube the written sources speak of Pecheneg raids directly (and often with dates),<sup>218</sup> such reports are lacking for 10th- and 11th-century Crimea. This complicates the interpretation of the finds.

Vadym Mayko believes that the simultaneous disappearance of the settlements of the Saltovo-Mayaki culture in Crimea and Kuban was caused by a Pecheneg invasion, and that a campaign mounted by the Khazar chieftain

- 
- 208 Victor L. Myts and Svetlana B. Adaksina, "Nakhodki zolotykh vizantiyskikh monet iz Alustona," *Stratum plus* (1999), no. 6, 125. In Aluston, four layers with marks of extensive burning were found inside the city and one outside the city walls: Mayko, *Vostochnyy Krym vo vtoroy polovine X–XII vv.*, 190.
- 209 Naumenko, "Nekotoryye klyuchevyye voprosy istorii Tavriki X–XI vv.," 187.
- 210 Mayko, *Vostochnyy Krym vo vtoroy polovine X–XII vv.*, 190.
- 211 Victor L. Myts, "Krestoobraznyy khram Mangupa," *SovArkh* (1990), no. 1, 240; Mayko, "Arkheologicheskaya situatsiya v srednevekovoy Tavrike i na Tamani," 102–8.
- 212 Mayko, *Vostochnyy Krym vo vtoroy polovine X–XII vv.*, 44.
- 213 Naumenko, "Nekotoryye klyuchevyye voprosy istorii Tavriki X–XI vv.," 177; Alexandr V. Sazonov, "K khronologii tsitadeli Baklinskogo gorodishcha IX–XI vekov," in *Problemy istorii i arkheologii Kryma*, ed. Yurii M. Mogarychev (Simferopol: Tavriya, 1994), 56.
- 214 Yurii M. Skobelev, "Arkheologicheskaya razvedka na g. Krestovoy v Verkhney Oreande," in *Feodal'naya Tavrika. Materialy po istorii i arkheologii Kryma*, 111; Myts, *Ukrepleniya Tavriki X–XV vv.*, 145.
- 215 Dombrovskii, "Srednevekovyye poseleniya i 'Isary' Krymskogo Yuzhnoberezh'ya," 28–9.
- 216 Tatyana I. Makarova, "Bospor-Korchev po arkheologicheskim dannym," in *Vizantiyskaya Tavrika: Sbornik nauchnykh trudov (k XVIII kongressu vizantinistov)*, ed. Petro P. Tolochko (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1991), 144.
- 217 Pletnyova believed that the burning and destruction occurred in the third quarter of the 10th century, given that the latest coins found in the burned-out layers date to 963: Pletnyova, "Kochevniki v Tamatarkhe," 104–5. See also: Mayko, "Arkheologicheskaya situatsiya v srednevekovoy Tavrike i na Tamani," 110.
- 218 See, for instance, Atanasov, "Anonimnyye vizantiyskiye follisy"; Gh. Mănucu-Adameșteanu, "Nashestviya pechenegov na Nizhnem Dunaye (1027–1048 gg.)."

Pesakh only completed the destruction.<sup>219</sup> In the aftermath of the invasion, life continued at Bosporos and Sugdaea. The Pechenegs were not able to destroy the almost impregnable city of Cherson(?) and its surroundings, and razing Bosporos and Sugdaea to the ground would have been against their economic interests.<sup>220</sup> The latter city would submit to their authority in the late 10th century.<sup>221</sup>

Specialists in Crimean archaeology see not only the Pechenegs, but also the Uzes and Cumans in the role of attackers and destroyers. Mayko argues that in 1048–54 the Pechenegs helped the inhabitants of Sugdaea against Uzes-Torks.<sup>222</sup> Tatyana Yashayeva, relying on coin finds (two from the reign of Romanos III and one minted under Romanos IV) and amphorae from Ganos (Γάνος), writes about the destruction of a settlement near Cherson as a result of a Cuman raid in the second half of the 11th century.<sup>223</sup> Destruction at Partenit could also be attributable to Cumans.<sup>224</sup>

Are the medieval nomads represented in the archaeology of Crimea only by burials and through their possible role in the destruction and burning of settlements? Not quite. Constantine Porphyrogenitus speaks of trade relations between the Pechenegs and Byzantine Crimea. While numerous finds of imported pottery on steppe sites in mainland Ukraine confirm this,<sup>225</sup> such evidence is comparatively rare in the peninsula.<sup>226</sup> Mikhail Frondzhulo's excavations in the town of Sudak (Byzantine Σουδαία) in 1965–68 uncovered a group of medieval dwellings, pottery, and coins suggesting that there may

219 Mayko, "Arkheologicheskaya situatsiya v srednevekovoy Tavrike i na Tamani," 116.

220 Ibid.

221 Vadym V. Mayko, "Sugdeya vo vtoroy polovine X–nachale XI vv.," in *Sugdeyskiy sbornik* 1, 242.

222 Mayko, *Vostochnyy Krym vo vtoroy polovine X–XII vv.*, 204.

223 Tatyana Yu. Yashayeva, "Rannesrednevekovoye poseleniye v predmest'ye Khersona na Gerakleyskom poluostrove," *Khersonesskiy sbornik* 10 (1999), 355–6.

224 Yelena A. Parshina, "Torzhishche v Partenitakh," in *Vizantiyskaya Tavrika*, 78–88 and 95; Valerii E. Naumenko, "Nekotoryye klyuchevyye voprosy istorii Tavriki X–XI vv.," 187. The Russian historian Aleksei Karpov drew attention to an interesting episode in the history of Cuman-Crimean trade relations recorded in the *Vitae of the Blessed Evstratii the Fast-Keeper* (discourse 16 from the *Paterik* of the Kyivan Caves Monastery), which tells of 50 Christian captives sold to Cumans in Cherson, with Jewish merchants acting as intermediaries, possibly after the raid of 1095/96: Aleksei Yu. Karpov, "Neskol'ko zamechaniy k Slovu o Prepodobnom Yevstratii Postnike," in *Rossiya i khristianskiy Vostok*, ed. Sergei N. Kisterev (Moscow: Indrik, 1997), 7–17.

225 Kravchenko, "Poseleniya khazarskogo vremeni (Severo-Vostochnoye Priazov'ye, Donetskii Kryazh, Stepnoye Podontsov'ye)," 284 and 289.

226 Alla I. Romančuk, "Das mittelalterliche Cherson und die Barbaren," *BS* 54 (1993), 59–60.

have been a Pecheneg quarter or settlement in that town in the 11th century.<sup>227</sup> Among the inventory of 10th- and 11th-century graves in Sudak, there are personal decorations (bone clasps) characteristic of nomadic burials.<sup>228</sup> A nomadic necropolis (attributed to the Uzes and Pechenegs) with Christian ritual elements was also found there.<sup>229</sup>

Increasingly, scholars tend to see nomads not only as agents of destruction (as evidenced by remnants of wreckage and finds of weapons, such as arrow- and spearheads, axes, or oval bone flails, which have parallels in Dobruja), but also as participants in commercial and cultural exchanges, and even as residents of Crimean towns and villages. Nomadic pottery, horse harness, and decorations (oval lead rings, bells) turn up at settlement sites.<sup>230</sup> Parallels to some types of personal decorations from Crimea (earrings, bracelets, bells, clasps) exist in the Balkans, including objects discovered at the Odürtsi necropolis, which may have belonged to the Pechenegs.<sup>231</sup> Mayko thus considers the presence of Turkic-speaking inhabitants in the medieval cities of at least eastern Crimea in the 10th and 11th centuries a proven fact.<sup>232</sup> Svetlana Pletnyova argues the same about not only the Crimean Peninsula, but also the opposite side of the Kerch Strait, namely the Taman hillfort commonly identified with the medieval town of Tamatarcha.<sup>233</sup>



The Volga-Don Archaeological Expedition of 1949–51 under the direction of Mikhail Artamonov gave a strong push to the development of Soviet late-nomadic archaeology and paleoanthropology. In the 1950s and 60s, several

227 Alexandr V. Dzhanov and Vadym V. Mayko, “Vizantiya i kochevniki v Yugo-Vostochnoy Tavrike v XI–XIII vv.,” *Khersonesskiy sbornik* 9 (1998), 171.

228 Vadym V. Mayko, “Sudakskie sklepy. Pozdny gorizont pogrebeniy,” *Sugdeyskiy sbornik* 4 (2010), 123.

229 Idem, “K voprosu ob arkheologicheskikh materialakh vtoroy poloviny X–XII vv. iz Yugo-Zapadnogo Kryma,” in *I Bakhchisarayskiye nauchnyye chteniya pamyati Ye. V. Veymarna. Tezisy dokladov i soobshcheniy*, eds. Olexandr I. Aybabin et al. (Bağçasaray: Bakhchisarayskiy istoriko-kul’turnyy zapovednik, 2003), 43.

230 Mayko, *Vostochnyy Krym vo vtoroy polovine X–XI vv.*, 115–22, 133–4, 148–9, 151–2.

231 Ibid., 162. Admittedly, the nomadic features of such “urban” finds may testify to the fashions of the time rather than serve as an ethnic marker (Ibid.). See also: Vadym V. Mayko, “Kochevnicheskiye elementy gorodskoy kul’tury Sugdei X–XI vv. Moda ili neodnorodnost’ etnosa,” in *Starodavniy Iskorosten’ i slov’yans’ki hrady*, vol. 2, ed. Olexandr P. Motsya (Korosten’: Triada S, 2008), 20–8.

232 Mayko, *Vostochnyy Krym vo vtoroy polovine X–XII vv.*, 209.

233 Pletnyova, “Kochevniki v Tamatarkhe,” 104–7.

competing systems and methods for the classification and attribution of medieval nomadic burials between the Volga and Dnieper were developed, including those by Pletnyova, Zyablin, Metz, and Fyodorov-Davydov. The latter's was generally acknowledged as the most promising. Pletnyova and Fyodorov-Davydov attempted broader studies of not only the "political" history, but also the social development of the region's nomads.

At that time, relatively little late-nomadic remains were known in Romania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Hungary. Therefore, Soviet archaeologists' interpretations of the material record of the Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans in the North Pontic steppes were important for making sense of nomadic materials discovered in the former territories of the Byzantine Empire and its neighbors, and thus for achieving further progress in studies of Byzantine-nomadic relations in general.

The funding of grandiose construction projects, part of which had to be allocated for archaeological exploration, came to an end with the fall of the Soviet Union.<sup>234</sup> On the other hand, archaeological work was liberated from ideological constraints, direct and indirect prohibitions, and the obligation to tie all conclusions into the foundational Marxist postulates. In Ukraine, Russia, and Moldova, a host of new periodicals has appeared showing interest in the problem of medieval nomads.<sup>235</sup> Attention to the study of regional history has grown in the national republics of the Russian Federation. Vertical academic connections (center-periphery) have been replaced by numerous horizontal ones across the former peripheries.<sup>236</sup>

234 Maksym Kvitnyts'kyi, a Ukrainian archaeologist specializing in nomadic subjects, stresses that most of the "nomadic" archaeological discoveries of the Soviet era still remain unprocessed and unpublished: Maksym V. Kvitnyts'kyi, "Kochovyky pivdenorus'koho stepu za doby rozvynutoho seredn'ovichchya (istoriohrafiiya, stan ta perspektyvy doslidzhennya)," *ADIU* (2010), no. 1, 118–9.

235 Here is a very incomplete list: *Materials for the Archaeology, History, and Ethnography of Taurica*, (Simferopol, since 1990); *The Steppes of Europe in the Middle Ages* (Donetsk, since 2000); *The Khazar Almanac* (Kharkiv, since 2002); *The Sugdaean Collection* (Kyiv/Sudak, since 2004); *Materials for the Archaeology and History of Ancient and Medieval Crimea* (Simferopol, since 2008); *Archaeology of the Eurasian Steppes* (Kazan, since 2007); *Materials and Studies in the Archaeology of Kuban'* (Krasnodar, since 2000); *Materials and Studies in the Archaeology of the North Caucasus* (Armavir and Stavropol, since 2003); *Antiquities of Bosporos* (Moscow, since 1998); *Tatar Archaeology* (Kazan, since 1997); *Finno-Ugrica* (Kazan, since 1997); *Volga Archaeology* (Kazan, since 2012); *Stratum plus* (Chişinău, since 1999).

236 The collection of articles *Put' iz Bulgara v Kyïev*, ed. Petro P. Tolochko (Kazan, 1992) is an example of such "horizontal" academic ties between the scholarly communities of Kazan and Kyiv.

Do we have a straightforward system for identifying the burials and other material remains of the Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans yet? Perhaps not, but the growing number of finds attributable to the so-called late-medieval nomads in the area from the Volga to Danube continues to deepen our knowledge of them.

## 2 Soviet and Post-Soviet Medieval Studies

The most prominent subjects of study for Soviet Byzantinologists in the second half of the 20th century were Russo-Byzantine relations and the social history of Byzantium. This was a legacy of the development of Byzantine studies both in pre-revolutionary Russia and the pre-war USSR. At the same time, Soviet Byzantine studies lost their former taste for big issues and their universalist approach to the history of the empire – the taste manifested, for instance, in *Byzantium and the Arabs* by Alexander Vasiliev. The interest in the medieval history of Bulgaria and its connections with Byzantium and the Slavic world, on the other hand, persisted.

The Marxist methodology gradually asserted itself in post-war Soviet scholarship. Mitrofan Levchenko's 1940 *History of Byzantium*,<sup>237</sup> while peppered with quotations from the works of Marx and Engels, generally remains a typically positivist account of important events. On the other hand, class analysis already fully shapes, for instance, Gennadii Litavrin's exploration of social relations in Byzantium in his 1960 book *Bulgaria and Byzantium*.<sup>238</sup>

There were a number of reasons for the general growth of academic interest in the history of Byzantium in the USSR in the post-war decades, evident, among other things, in the resumed publication of periodicals on Byzantine studies.<sup>239</sup> Chief among these reasons was the new status of the USSR as a superpower, which had to be projected into the past. The power victorious in World War II had to have an equally grand and victorious history.<sup>240</sup>

237 Mitrofan V. Levchenko, *Istoriya Vizantii. Kratkiy ocherk*.

238 Gennadii G. Litavrin, *Bolgariya i Vizantiya v XI–XII vv.*; Emil Niederhauser, "[Review of:] Litavrin G.G., *Bolgariya i Vizantiya v XI–XII vv.*," *Szásadok* (1963), no. 2, 432–3.

239 Georgii L. Kurbatov, *Istoriya Vizantii. Istoriografiya* (Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo universiteta, 1975), 191.

240 We may observe this change in the first post-war editions of *The History of the USSR*. See: *Istoriya SRSR*, vol. 1, *Znaydavnishykh chasiv do kintsya XVIII stolittya*, eds. Borys D. Rybakov et al. (Kyiv, 1950). In the view of Academician Yevgeny V. Tarle, Marxist dialectic demanded that the entire history of the USSR be studied from the vantage point of 1944:



Under these circumstances, the relations between Byzantium and the nomads of the North Pontic steppe could not aspire to the status of a problem in its own right. They were considered in Soviet Byzantine studies almost exclusively as an aspect of other subjects, mainly the Byzantine vector of the foreign policy of Rus', the history of medieval Bulgaria, or in critical editions of Byzantine primary sources.

Characteristic from this point of view was scholarly interest in the campaigns of Sviatoslav, which picked up in the period between 1936 and 1956.<sup>241</sup> Petro Karyshkovskii-Ikar (1921–88) worked extensively on this topic, beginning with a thesis on "Political Relations between the Byzantine Empire, Bulgaria, and Rus' in the Years 967–971." He dwelled deeply on the notable role of the Pechenegs in Sviatoslav's Balkan campaigns, as, alternatively, participants in the anti-Byzantine coalition and Byzantium's allies against the Kyivan prince.<sup>242</sup> Nikolaï Polovoy, in his turn, considered the problem of the Pechenegs' part in the second campaign of Prince Igor'.<sup>243</sup>

Mitrofan Levchenko (1890–1955) practiced a many-sided approach to Russo-Byzantine relations.<sup>244</sup> He reconsidered a number of statements made by V. Vasilievskii, which had already attained the status of axioms in Soviet

---

Kalpana Sahni, *Crucifying the Orient – Russian Orientalism and the Colonization of Caucasus and Central Asia* (Bangkok and Oslo: White Orchid Press, 1997), 214.

- 241 Andreï N. Sakharov, *Diplomatiya Svyatoslava* (Moscow: Mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya, 1982), 62–72.
- 242 Petro O. Karyshkovskii, "O khronologii russko-vizantiyskoy voyny pri Svyatoslave," *VizVrem* 5 (1952), 127–38; Idem, "Balkanskiye voyny Svyatoslava v vizantiyskoy istoricheskoy literature," *VizVrem* 6 (1953), 36–71; Idem, "K istorii balkanskikh voyn Svyatoslava," *VizVrem* 7 (1953), 224–43. On the reliability of the reconstruction of the events of Sviatoslav's last Balkan campaign, see: Mikhail Raev, "The Russian-Byzantine treaty of 971: Theophilos and Sveneld," *REB* 64–65 (2006), 329–40; Danilevskii, *Povest' vremennykh let: Germenevticheskiye osnovy istochnikovedeniya letopisnykh tekstov*, 124–129; Oleksii V. Komar, "Mesto gibeli knyazya Svyatoslava: poiski, legendy, gipotezy, mistifikatsii," *Stratum plus* (2014), no. 5, 235–56; Olexandr O. Romenskii, *Imperiya romeyev i 'tavroskify'. Ocherki russko-vizantiyskikh otnosheniy posledney chetverti X v.* (Khariv: Maydan, 2017).
- 243 Nikolaï Ya. Polovoy, "O date vtorogo pokhoda Igorya na grekov i pokhoda russkikh na Berdaa," *VizVrem* 14 (1958), 138–47.
- 244 Mitrofan V. Levchenko, "Tsennyy istochnik po voprosu russko-vizantiyskikh otnosheniy v X veke ('Zapiska grecheskogo toparkha')," *VizVrem* 4 (1951), 42–72; Idem, "Proizvedeniya Konstantina Bagryanorodnogo kak istochnik po istorii Rusi v pervoy polovine X veka," *VizVrem* 6 (1953), 11–35; Idem, "Problema russko-vizantiyskikh otnosheniy v russkoy dorevolutsionnoy, zarubezhnoy i sovetskoy istoriografii," *VizVrem* 8 (1956), 7–25; Idem, *Ocherki po istorii russko-vizantiyskikh otnosheniy*.

historiography.<sup>245</sup> In his *Essays in the History of Russo-Byzantine Relations*, Levchenko touched on the questions of Pecheneg participation in Igor's second campaign against Byzantium and the importance of the trilateral relations between the empire, Rus', and the Steppe.<sup>246</sup>

Gennadii G. Litavrin (1925–2009)<sup>247</sup> was one of the most important figures in Soviet and modern Russian Byzantine studies. In the book *Bulgaria and Byzantium in the 11th to 12th Centuries*, based on his dissertation, Litavrin repeatedly addressed nomadic raids,<sup>248</sup> despite his stated intention not to “dwell” on that subject.<sup>249</sup> He represented the nomads and the local population of the Balkan provinces as antagonists. The influence of “Byzantium and the Pechenegs” is palpable in this work,<sup>250</sup> but Litavrin disputed a number of claims made by Vasilievskii and his followers.<sup>251</sup>

Vasilievskii's key points that became firmly established (in modified form) in subsequent Russian and Soviet historiography were that in the 11th century Rus' may have given help to Byzantium in some form (Mikhail Pokrovskii and Vladimir Pashuto) and that relations between Rus', Byzantium, and the nomads were inseparably intertwined. In his classic polemical statement coauthored with Valentin Yanin, Litavrin opposed the “exaggeration” of the role of the steppe peoples in Russo-Byzantine relations in general.<sup>252</sup> Later, he also strongly disputed the idea that Rus' helped Constantinople against the nomads in the 11th century.<sup>253</sup> In his view, it was actually the presence of Turkic nomads on Byzantium's borders that safeguarded the empire against Kyiv's expansion.<sup>254</sup>

245 Levchenko, “Problema russko-vizantiyskikh otnosheniy,” 11–2; Idem, *Ocherki po istorii russko-vizantiyskikh otnosheniy*, 407–10 and 427.

246 Ibid., 149, 157, 264–65, 399.

247 Igor' P. Medvedyev and Boris N. Florya, “G.G. Litavrin. Kratkiy ocherk nauchnoy deyatel'nosti,” in *ΓΕΝΝΑΔΙΟΣ: κ 70-letiyu akademika G.G. Litavrina*, ed. Boris N. Florya (Moscow: Indrik, 1999), 7–22.

248 Litavrin, *Bolgariya i Vizantiya v XI–XII vv.*, 128, 136, 264–82, 351, 388, 399, 410–13, 419–22. The work does suffer from some serious factual inaccuracies. See, for instance, Ibid., 274 and 410.

249 Ibid., 411.

250 Ibid., 419.

251 Ibid., 281–2.

252 Valentin L. Yanin and Gennadii G. Litavrin, “Nekotoryye problemy russko-vizantiyskikh otnosheniy v IX–XV vv.,” *Istoriya SSSR* (1970), no. 4, 34.

253 Gennadii G. Litavrin, “Geopoliticheskoye polozheniye Vizantii v srednevekovom mire v VII–XII vv.,” in *Vizantiya mezhdum Zapadom i Vostokom. Opyt istoricheskoy kharakteristiki*, ed. Gennadii G. Litavrin (Saint Petersburg: Aleteya, 1999), 40.

254 Ibid., 41.

Across most of Litavrin's works on the history of Bulgaria and Byzantium in the 10th to 12th centuries ran the idea that the steppe nomads had a negative impact on the economic development of the Balkans and caused their inhabitants a lot of suffering.<sup>255</sup> He considered the appearance of Pecheneg settlements in the lands of former Bulgaria as a manifestation of the imperial government's hostility towards the Bulgarians, which encountered a strong resistance from the local population.<sup>256</sup> That population, however, repeatedly sided with Constantinople in its prolonged strife with the trans-Danubian nomads throughout the 11th century.<sup>257</sup>

The most serious flaw in Litavrin's interpretation of the role of the trans-Danubian Turks in the history of Byzantium was not so much that he portrayed them negatively as that he virtually ignored them. Thus, for instance, in a paper presented by Litavrin and Kazhdan at the 13th International Congress of Byzantine Studies in Oxford, they entirely disregarded the steppe factor in Russo-Byzantine relations.<sup>258</sup> In his article "Peoples of the Balkan Peninsula in the Byzantine Empire in the 11th and 12th Centuries," which came out in 1981, Litavrin wrote: "We will not dwell on a number of small ethnic groups. We are interested primarily in the Bulgarians, Vlachs, Albanians, Armenians, and Slavic settlers in the above-mentioned regions."<sup>259</sup>

The problem of the coexistence and interaction of various medieval peoples was the topic of many international scholarly meetings.<sup>260</sup> However, nomads were generally overlooked in such discussions. One characteristic example of this neglect is the collection of essays *The Adoption of Christianity by the Peoples of Central and Southeastern Europe and the Baptism of Rus'*, published by the Institute of Slavic and Balkan Studies of the Academy of Sciences of the

255 See, for instance, Gennadii G. Litavrin, "Tempove i spetsifika na sotsialno-ikonomiceskoto razvitiie na srednovekovna Bŭlgariya v sravnenie s Vizantiya (ot kraya na VII do kraya na XII vv.)," *IstPreg* (1979), no. 6, 37.

256 Idem, "Osobennosti razvitiya samosoznaniya bolgarskoy narodnosti so vtoroy chetverti X do kontsa XIV v.," in *Razvitiye etnicheskogo samosoznaniya slavyanskikh narodov v epokhu zrelogo feodalizma*, ed. Gennadii G. Litavrin, (Moscow: Nauka, 1989), 49.

257 Ibid., 51–3.

258 Litavrin and Kazhdan, "Ekonomicheskiye i politicheskiye otnosheniya Drevney Rusi i Vizantii v XI-XII vv."

259 Gennadii G. Litavrin, "Narody Balkanskogo poluostrova v sostave Vizantiyskoy imperii v XI-XII vv.," in *Formirovaniye rannefeodal'nykh slavyanskikh narodnostey*, ed. Vladimir D. Korolyuk et al. (Moscow: Nauka, 1981), 171.

260 See, for instance, Gennadii G. Litavrin, "Vvedeniye," in *Etnosotsial'naya i politicheskaya struktura rannefeodal'nykh slavyanskikh gosudarstv i narodnostey*, ed. Gennadii G. Litavrin (Moscow, 1987), 4.

USSR.<sup>261</sup> Not a single one of the contributions mentions Byzantium's attempts to baptize its Turkic neighbors, or the Christianization of some Turkic chieftains in Rus'.<sup>262</sup>

In the words of Litavrin, "scholars of those countries whose territories were part of the Byzantine Empire or whose history was closely intertwined with its fate worked with particular commitment on those aspects of Byzantine studies which had to do with their national history."<sup>263</sup> The nomads of the North Pontic steppes who asserted themselves in the Balkans in the 10th and 11th centuries did not have a national historiography of their own. This was one of the main reasons why Soviet Byzantinology not only viewed Turkic-Byzantine studies as a separate subject, but also tended to bypass this subject entirely when considering related topics.

The only field where Soviet researchers could not ignore this issue was the publication and criticism of Byzantine sources. Litavrin's accomplishments in this sphere are undeniable. In 1957, he turned to the problem of the *Toparcha Gothicus*, publishing the surviving fragments with commentaries.<sup>264</sup> Fifteen years later, he prepared an edition of the *Strategikon of Kekaumenos* – a valuable source for the history of Pecheneg-Byzantine relations in the 11th century.<sup>265</sup> In 1988, Litavrin supervised the publication of the *History* of Leo the Deacon.<sup>266</sup> In 1989, the long-awaited complete Russian edition of the *DAI* was finally published by Litavrin and Anatolii P. Novosel'tsev (1933–95).<sup>267</sup> This up-to-date volume drew on the full range of Byzantinology's achievements in the study of the source and was furnished with a commentary and bibliography,

261 *Prinyatiye khristianstva narodami Tsentral'noy i Yugo-Vostochnoy Yevropy i kreshcheniye Rusi*, ed. Gennadii G. Litavrin (Moscow: Nauka, 1988).

262 In recent Russian historiography, the problem of the Christianization of the Pechenegs has been touched on by Sergei Ivanov: Sergei A. Ivanov, "Missiya vostochnokhristianskoy tserkvi k slavyanam i kochevnikam: evolyutsiya metodov," *Slavyane i ikh sosedi*, Issue 10, *Slavyane i kochevoy mir*, ed. Boris N. Florya (Moscow: Nauka, 2001), 16–39; Sergei A. Ivanov, *Vizantiyskoye missionerstvo. Mozhno li sdelat' iz "varvara" khristianina?* (Moscow: Yazyki slavyanskoy kul'tury, 2003), 226–30, 240. Ivanov also addressed the subject of the Byzantine-Pecheneg relations around the time of Sviatoslav's campaigns to Bulgaria and Byzantium: Idem, "Vizantiysko-bolgarskiye otnosheniya v 966–969 gg.," *VizVrem* 42 (1981), 98.

263 Gennadii G. Litavrin, *Vizantiyskoye obshchestvo i gosudarstvo v X-XI vv. (Problemy istorii odnogo stoletiya. 976-1081 gg.)* (Moscow: Nauka, 1977), 156.

264 Lipshits, "Vizantiyskiye pis'mennyye istochniki," 78.

265 *Sovety i rassказы Kekavmena. Sochineniye vizantiyskogo polkovodtsa XI v.*

266 Lev Diakon, *Istoriya*, ed. Gennadii G. Litavrin, transl. Moysēi M. Kopylenko, comment. Mikhail Ya. Syuzumov and Sergei A. Ivanov (Moscow: Nauka, 1988).

267 Konstantin Bagryanorodnyi, *Ob upravlenii imperiyey. Tekst, perevod, kommentarii.*

which was an advantage over the 1982 Russian edition of the *DAI*<sup>268</sup> and a number of even earlier ones (1934 and before).<sup>269</sup>

The publication of primary sources, including Byzantine ones, traditionally ranked high among the priorities of Soviet historians.<sup>270</sup> Generally, the study and publication of important Byzantine sources in Soviet and Russian historiography most often moved forward thanks to the efforts of individual (usually prominent) scholars, such as Kazhdan, Lyubarskiĭ, Bibikov, and others, rather than as a result of systematic institutional programs.

Alexander P. Kazhdan (1922–97)<sup>271</sup> started out as a student of the Byzantine economy, but gradually his interests shifted toward a broad exploration of the Byzantine literature of the 7th to 12th centuries and the social history of

268 Konstantin Bagryanorodnyi, "Ob upravlenii imperiyey," in *Razvitiye etnicheskogo samosoznaniya slavyanskikh narodov v epokhu rannego srednevekov'ya*, eds. Vladimir D. Korolyuk et al. (Moscow: Nauka, 1982), 267–320.

269 Lipshits, "Vizantiyskiye pis'mennyye istochniki," 74. The wide availability of the new edition (thanks in part to its large print run) added to its significance, considering that most Soviet researchers did not have access to Moravcsik's and Jenkins's edition and English translation, or were not able to use it due to the language barrier. Now new interpretations could appear (for instance: Konovalova and Perkhavko, *Drevnyaya Rus' i Nizhneye Podunav'ye*; Irina G. Konovalova, "Pechenezhskoye dos'ye Konstantina Bagryanorodnogo," in *Vostochnaya Yevropa v drevnosti i srednevekov'ye. Avtor i yego istochnik: Vospriyatiye, otnosheniye, interpretatsiya. XXI Chteniya pamyati chl.-korr. AN SSSR V.T. Pashuto. Moskva, 14–17 aprelya 2009 g. Materialy konferentsii* (Moscow: Institut vseobshchey istorii RAN, 2009), 139–46; Eadem, "Pechenegi v kontekste rasskaza Konstantina Bagryanorodnogo o 'severnykh narodakh,'" in *Studia et Documenta Turcologica* 1 (2013), 269–75).

270 Vladimir T. Pashuto and Boris A. Rybakov, "Korpus drevneyshikh istochnikov po istorii narodov SSSR," *VopIs* (1974), no. 7, 49–54. So, for instance, a 1969 decree of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (*sic!*) called attention to the need for the publication of translations of Byzantine, Latin, and Oriental sources for the history of the peoples of the USSR: "Itogi i zadachi izucheniya istorii drevneyshikh gosudarstv nashey strany," *Istoriya SSSR* (1974), no. 2, 90–1. However, because source publication was a very demanding and labor-intensive enterprise, requiring many years of work on the part of not only distinguished academic stars, but often also entire sections of research institutes, grand schemes in this sphere often fell through. In 1976 and 1980, thematic plans were released for the publication of sources for the history of the peoples of the USSR, projecting seven volumes of Byzantine sources from the 7th to 13th centuries (series AI-4), together with a number of Scandinavian sagas and works by Eastern authors containing information about, among other things, Byzantium's relations with trans-Danubian Turks. Most of these plans never came to fruition: *Drevneyshiy istochniki po istorii narodov SSSR. Tematika i sostav vypuskov po Yevropeyskomu regionu. (Materialy dlya obsuzhdeniya)*, 2 vols, eds. Vladimir T. Pashuto and Yaroslav N. Shchapov (Moscow: Institut istorii SSSR AN SSSR, 1976–1980).

271 For a bibliography of the historian's works and materials for his biography, see: *Mir Aleksandra Kazhdana: k 80-letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya*, ed. Alexandra A. Chekalova (Saint Petersburg: Aleteya, 2003); *Homo Byzantinus: papers in honor of Alexander Kazhdan*,

the empire. Of great importance are his articles on individual problems of Byzantine history, historiographical works, and the part he played in the publication of the fundamental Soviet *History of Byzantium* (1967)<sup>272</sup> and *ODB* (1983–1991).<sup>273</sup>

Despite its modest length, Kazhdan's article "John Mauropous, the Pechenegs, and the Rus' in the Mid-11th Century" revolutionized the chronology of relations between the Pechenegs and Byzantium. Analyzing the speeches of the Byzantine ecclesiastical figure Ioannes Mauropous, he faced difficulties in dating some of them (the so-called *Orationes* 181 and 182). Since one of the speeches mentioned St. George's Day as falling on the third day after Easter, which in the 11th century could only occur in 1044, 1047, and 1052, Kazhdan chose the second of these as the date of both speeches. As the second speech mentioned the Pechenegs crossing the Danube, the dating of the mid-11th-century confrontation between the Pechenegs and Byzantium, associated with the names of Kegen and Tyrach, had to be reconsidered accordingly. Kazhdan dated Kegen's crossover into Byzantium to 1045, Tyrach's raid to January 1046, and the defeat of his army at the hands of the Byzantines to the summer of that year or the summer of 1047. This caused some confusion in the historiography.<sup>274</sup> Kazhdan also argued that, since Mauropous's description

---

eds. Anthony Cutler and Simon Franklin (Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1992).

272 *Istoriya Vizantii*, 3 vols, ed. Sergei D. Skazkin (Moscow: Nauka, 1967).

273 *ODB*.

274 According to V. Vasilievskii, the *terminus post quem* was 1048 (Vasilievskii, "Vizantiya i pechenēgi (1048–1094)," 12), which date was widely accepted in the subsequent historiography (Macartney, "The Pechenegs," 347; Zlatarski, *Istoriya na bŭlgarskata dŭrzhava prez Srednite vekove*, 2, 91–2). The dating proposed by Kazhdan was accepted by Poppe and Ostrogorsky (Jonathan Shepard, "John Mauropous, Leo Tornicius and Alleged Russian Army: The Chronology of the Pecheneg Crisis of 1048–1049," *JÖB* 24 (1975), 65). Petre Diaconu took note of it, but adhered to Vasilievskii's version: Diaconu, *Les Petchénègues au Bas-Danube*, 52. The year 1048 also figured in the arguments of Vasilka Tŭpkova-Zaimova, but she noted its provisional status: Tŭpkova-Zaimova, *Dolni Dunav – granichna zona*, 75. As for Soviet scholars, Knyazkiĭ continued to favor Vasilievskii's dating even after Kazhdan's article came out (Igor' O. Knyazkiĭ, "Pis'mennyye istochniki o kochevnikakh v Dnestrovsko-Karpatskikh zemlyakh v XI–XII vv.," in *Problemy istochnikovedeniya istorii Moldavii perioda feodalizma i kapitalizma*, eds. Pavel V. Sovetov et al. (Kishinev: Shtiintsa, 1983), 8), although it is possible that he was not familiar with it. Lyubarskiĭ and Litavrin, in their commentaries to the *Alexiad* and the work of Kekaumenos respectively, both gave 1046/47 as the date of the invasion of the Byzantine territory by Tyrach's Pechenegs (Yakov Lyubarskiĭ, "Khronologicheskaya tablitsa," in Anna Komnina. *Aleksiada*, ed., transl, comment. Yakov Lyubarskiĭ (Moscow: Nauka, 1965), 650; *Sovety i rasskazy Kekavmena. Sochineniye vizantiyskogo polkovodtsa XI v.*, 352). See also: Alexandr P. Kazhdan, "Once More About the 'Alleged' Russo-Byzantine Treaty (ca. 1047) and the Pecheneg Crossing of

of the suppression of the rebellion of Tornikios contains a reference to a “northern army” and “barbarians,” this “barbaric northern army” could have been either Pecheneg (which idea Kazhdan rejected) or Rus’. In the latter case, this Rus’ force would have been helping Byzantium in keeping with the treaty of 1043.<sup>275</sup> In his article “From the History of Byzantine-Hungarian Ties,” Kazhdan questioned the fact of the marriage between Synadene, the niece of Nikephoros Botaneiates, and an unnamed Hungarian monarch, recorded in the *Skylitzes Continuatus*.<sup>276</sup>

In a study of the Byzantine ruling class, Kazhdan noted the possibility that a number of Byzantine aristocratic families, such as the Alakaseis, could be of Pecheneg descent.<sup>277</sup> Thanks to his work, it became clear that the Pechenegs, as well as the Cumans later on, were part of the circle of peoples, including the Greeks, Armenians, Georgians, Alans, and some others, who participated in forming the ruling class of the empire. Of course, such facts were at odds with Soviet historiography’s tradition of portraying the Pechenegs as wild barbarians.

Another Russian medievalist, Yakov N. Lyubarskiĭ (1929–2003), worked on Byzantine authors and texts of the 11th century, mainly the works of Anna Komnene, Michael Psellos, and *Theophanes Continuatus*. He attempted to

---

the Danube,” *JÖB* 26 (1977), 65–77; Jacques Lefort, “Rhétorique et politique. Trois discours de Jean Mauropous en 1047,” *Travaux et Mémoires* (1976), no. 6, 273–84. Since the crossing of the Danube by the Pechenegs was accompanied by extraordinary weather conditions, it may be possible to date it using other sources from the period that may recall a particularly severe winter in 1046, 1047, or 1048.

275 Alexandr P. Kazhdan, “Ioann Mavropod, pechenegi i russkiye v seredine XI v.,” *ZRVI* 8 (1963), 177–84.

276 In Kazhdan’s view, if the marriage took place at all, it happened in 1080, and it was László I (1077–95), rather than Géza, who became the husband of Synadene. Furthermore, the marriage would have become possible thanks to the existence of a treaty between Hungary and Byzantium directed against the trans-Danubian nomads. As part of the strengthening of the northern border against the steppe peoples, Constantinople appointed a new *δούξ* in Skopje and sent Leo Dabaténos as an ambassador to the Pechenegs and Cumans: Alexandr P. Kazhdan, “Iz istorii vizantino-vengerskikh svyazey,” *Acta Antiqua ASH* 10 (1962), no. 1–3, 164–5. See also: Rajmund Kerbl, *Byzantinische Prinzessinnen in Ungarn zwischen 1050–1200 und ihr Einfluss auf das Arpadenköningreich* (Vienna: wvGÖ, 1979); Shepard, “Byzantium and the Steppe-Nomads: The Hungarian Dimension,” 72–83; Jean-Claude Cheynet, “L’Empire byzantin et la Hongrie dans la seconde moitié du XIe siècle,” *Acta Historiae Artium* 43 (2002), no. 1, 5–13.

277 Alexandr P. Kazhdan, *Sotsial’nyi sostav gosподstvuyushchego klassa Vizantii XI–XII vv.* (Moscow: Nauka, 1974), 188, 201 and 213. See also: Alexios Savvides, “O vyzantinós oikos ton Alakádon-Alakaséon (20 misó 100u – téli 110u ai.)” *Byzantiaka* 11 (1991), 231–40.

clarify the chronology of the events described in the *Alexiad*.<sup>278</sup> His translation of that text, published in 1965, was a notable event in the Soviet field of Byzantine studies.<sup>279</sup> The translation was based on the latest Western critical editions; the extensive commentary represented the state of the art in a number of problems of Byzantine history of the mid-11th to early 12th century. This, together with the extensive bibliography, chronological table, and maps, made the book a sort of encyclopedia of the history of Southeastern Europe and the Middle East in that era.

Mikhail Bibikov, one of today's leading Russian specialists in Byzantine primary sources, has focused his efforts mainly on the works of Ioannes Kinnamos and Niketas Choniates.<sup>280</sup> He devoted a number of articles to questions of Byzantine ethnonymics, particularly to the "ethnic" terms *Σκύθαι*, *Τούρκοι*, *Βλάχοι*, and some others found in the Byzantine sources of the 10th to 12th

278 Yakov N. Lyubarskiĭ, "Zamechaniya k khronologii XI knigi 'Aleksiady' Anny Komninoy," *VizVrem* 23 (1963), 47–56; Idem, "Ob istochnikakh 'Aleksiady' Anny Komninoy," *VizVrem* 25 (1964), 99–120. Reviewing an article by Paul Gautier, Yakov Lyubarskiĭ noted that the largely conjectural chronology of "Byzantium and the Pechenegs" had for too long been roving from study to study, and it was time to reconsider it: Yakov N. Lyubarskiĭ, "[Review of:] Gautier P., 'Le Discours de Th eophylacte de Bulgarie   l'autocrator Alexis I-er Comn ene (6 janvier 1088),' *Revue des  tudes Byzantines*, XX, 1962, p. 93–130," *VizVrem* 25 (1964), 270). In 1966, Lyubarskiĭ enlisted the help of scientists from the Leningrad Institute of Theoretical Astronomy to clarify the date of the negotiations between Alexios I Komnenos and the Pechenegs (1 August 1087), which coincided with a solar eclipse. Furthermore, taking the date of the eclipse as the *terminus post quem* and 29 April 1091 (the date of the Battle of Levounion) as *terminus ante quem*, he proposed a new chronological ordering of the events of the Byzantine-Pecheneg war of the late 11th century. In Lyubarskiĭ's view, Vasilievskiĭ mistakenly dated the negotiations by 20 July 1088, which then led to further errors in the dating of many of the episodes of that war: Yakov N. Lyubarskiĭ, "Vizantiysko-pechenezhskaya voyna 1086–1091 gg. na territorii Balkan." This article by Lyubarskiĭ, published in an obscure collection, remained unknown to foreign scholars. Thus, for instance, Petre Diaconu in his account of the events of 1086–91 followed Vasilievskiĭ's chronology: Diaconu, *Les Petch n gues au Bas-Danube*, 116–7. See also: Konradin Ferrari d'Occhieppo, "Zur Identifizierung der Sonnenfinsternis w ahrend des Petschenegenkrieges Alexios' I. Komnenos (1084)," *J OB* 23 (1974), 179–84; Paul Gautier, "R equisitoire du patriarche Jean d'Antioche contre le charisticariat," *R EB* 33 (1975), 82; Meřko, "Notes sur la chronologie de la guerre des Byzantins contre les Petch n gues (1083–1091)."

279 Anna Komnina. *Aleksiada*. In 1964, Ya. Lyubarskiĭ defended a dissertation on "The Alexiad of Anna Komnene as a Historical Source."

280 Some of his early works, however, deal with earlier periods – for instance, his 1975 reaction to the publication of the *Taktikon Escorial* by Oikonomid s: Mikhail V. Bibikov, "Novyye dannyye Taktikona Ikonomidisa o Severnom Prichernomor'ye i russko-vizantiyskikh otnosheniyakh," in *Drevneyshiy gosudarstva na territorii SSSR (1975)*, ed. Vladimir T. Pashuto (Moscow: Nauka, 1976), 87–9.



centuries.<sup>281</sup> In his view, “medieval names are categories that not only refer to ethnic origins, but also contain a general, rooted in tradition idea about the area of residence, way of life, activities, habits, and customs of a people.”<sup>282</sup> He also considered the question of whether it was the Pechenegs or Cumans who invaded the imperial lands in 1121/22, which led him to sketch out a general picture of the relations between the trans-Danubian nomads and Byzantium in the 12th and 13th centuries.<sup>283</sup>

Viada Arutyunova-Fidayan found in the *Typikon* for the Monastery of the Mother of God Petritzonitissa in Bachkovo (gifted by the *Megas Domestikos* of the Entire West, Gregorios Pakourianos) information about an important battle between a Byzantine army and Pecheneg-Cuman raiders. According to Arutyunova-Fidayan, in September-December 1083, Gregorios Pakourianos repelled a large Pecheneg incursion but was defeated by a party of Cumans,

281 Mikhail V. Bibikov, “Puti immanentnogo analiza vizantiyskikh istochnikov po srednevekovoy istorii SSSR,” in *Metodika izucheniya drevneyshikh istochnikov po istorii SSSR*, ed. Vladimir T. Pashuto (Moscow: Nauka, 1978), 92–110; Mikhail V. Bibikov, “K izucheniyu vizantiyskoy etnonimii,” in *Vizantiyskiye ocherki. Trudy sovetskikh uchenykh k XVI Mezhdunarodnomu kongressu vizantinistov*, ed. Zinaida V. Udaltsova (Moscow: Nauka, 1982), 148–59; Mikhail V. Bibikov, “Arkhaizatsiya v vizantiyskoy etnonimii,” in *Etnogenez narodov Balkan i Severnogo Prichernomor'ya. Lingvistika, istoriya, arkhologiiya*, ed. Leonid A. Gindin (Moscow: Nauka, 1984), 30–6; Mikhail V. Bibikov, “Kochevniki v trude Konstantina Bagryanorodnogo,” *Tsivilizatsiya i varvarstvo* (2015), no. 4, 186–203.

282 Idem, “K izucheniyu vizantiyskoy etnonimii,” 155.

283 Idem, “Istochnikovedcheskiye problemy izucheniya istorii kochevnikov v Nizhnem Podunav'ye v XII v.,” *RRH* (1980), no. 1, 47–52; Idem, “Svedeniya Ipat'yevskoy letopisi o pechenegakh i torkakh v svete dannykh vizantiyskikh istochnikov XII v.,” in *Letopisi i khroniki. 1980 g. (V.N. Tatishchev i izucheniye russkogo letopisaniya)*, ed. Boris A. Rybakov (Moscow: Nauka, 1981), 55–68; Idem, “Bolgariya, Rus', Vizantiya, polovtsy v sisteme mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniy v Yugo-Vostochnoy Yevrope XII–pervoy poloviny XIII vv.” In Bibikov's view, the invaders of 1121/22 were Pechenegs and Oghuzes (Bibikov, “Svedeniya Ipat'yevskoy letopisi o pechenegakh i torkakh v svete dannykh vizantiyskikh istochnikov XII v.,” 58). He gave no more than a cursory glance to the events of the 11th century, treating them as a prelude to the later Byzantine-Cuman interactions and to the central period of Byzantine-Pecheneg relations (on this topic, see also: Yaroslav V. Pylypchuk, “Kypchaki i Vizantiya (konets XI–nachalo XIII v.),” in *Issledovaniya po istorii Vostochnoy Yevropy* 5 (2012), 41–52). Bibikov's historiographical works and critical studies of primary sources focus on the 12th and 13th centuries. (Bibikov, *Vizantiyskiye istochniki po istorii Drevney Rusi i Kavkaza*; Idem, *Istoricheskaya literatura Vizantii* (Saint Petersburg: Aleteya, 1998), 128–51).

whom he had to pay off.<sup>284</sup> A number of other scholars working today have addressed the problem of Byzantine-Pecheneg relations as well.<sup>285</sup>

Insofar as Turko-Byzantine interactions in the 10th and 11th centuries did not take place in isolation from the surrounding world, wider Soviet medieval studies also contributed to their interpretation. Boris Rybakov (1908–2001), the Soviet patriarch of medieval studies, explored the possibility of using as historical sources the works of Vasilii Tatishchev<sup>286</sup> and *byliny* (Russian folk epic poems).<sup>287</sup> The former contain a great deal of information about the trilateral relations between Rus', Byzantium, and the Steppe, and the latter provide more insight regarding some individual players in the interactions between Byzantium and the Cumans, such as Boniak and Tugorkhan. Boris Ramm, in his book *The Papacy and Rus'*, touched on the mission of Bishop Bruno of Querfurt to the Pechenegs.<sup>288</sup> Mikhail Zaborov, author of numerous

284 Viada A. Arutyunova, "K voprosu o vzaimootnosheniyakh Vizantii s pechenegami i polovtsami vo vremya normannskoy kampanii," *VizVrem* 33 (1972), 119. Arutyunova's article appeared twelve years before the fundamental study by Paul Gautier, who arrived at similar conclusions (Paul Gautier, "Le typikon du sébaste Grégoire Pakourianos," *RÉB* 42 (1984), 43). See also: Peter Frankopan, "A victory of Gregory Pakourianos against the Pechenegs," *BS* 57 (1996), 278–81.

285 Valerii P. Stepanenko and Anton S. Mokhov, "Balkanskiy etap kar'yery Vasila, syna Apukhapa," *VizVrem* 67 (2008), 63–75; Anton S. Mokhov, "K voprosu o vizantiyskoy voyennoy organizatsii v period voyny s pechenegami 1046–1053 gg.," *Izvestiya Ural'skogo federal'nogo universiteta. Seriya 2: Gumanitarnyye nauki* 39 (2005), no. 10, 15–26; Olexandr M. Filipchuk, "Vizantiyskiye podkhody XI veka k probleme plennykh: oslepleniye i ubiystvo," *Dialog so vremenem* 55 (2016), 330–40; Sergii B. Sorochan, *Vizantiyskiy Kherson (vtoraya pol. VI-pervaya pol. X vv.). Ocherki istorii i kul'tury*, 2 vols (Kharkiv: Maydan, 2005); Idem, "Vizantiyskiy Kherson v pis'makh Nikolaya Mistika," *KhazarSKIY al'manakh* 10 (2012), 179–201; Nikolaï Alekseienko, "The Particulars of the Byzantine Administration in Taurica: Seals of the Stratores of Cherson," in *Byzantine and Rus' Seals*, eds. Glib Ivakin et al. (Kyiv, 2015), 55–60.

286 Boris A. Rybakov, "V.N. Tatishchev i letopisi XII v.," *Istoriya SSSR* (1971), no. 1, 91–109. See also: Olexsii P. Tolochko, "Istoriya Rossiyskaya" Vasiliiya Tatishcheva: istochniki i izvestiya (Kyiv: Krytyka, 2005); Mykola Melnyk, "On the Issue of the Authenticity of the Names of Pecheneg Rulers in the Nikonian Chronicle," in *The Steppe Lands and the World beyond Them*, 151–60.

287 Boris A. Rybakov, "Istoricheskiy vzglyad na russkiye byliny," *Istoriya SSSR* (1961), no. 5, 141–66; Idem, "Istoricheskiy vzglyad na russkiye byliny (okonchaniye)," *Istoriya SSSR* (1961), no. 6, 80–96; Igor' Ya. Froyanov and Yurii I. Yudin, "Po povodu odnoy kontseptsii istorizma bylin v noveyshey sovetskoy istoriografii (v prodolzheniye diskussii)," in *Problemy otechestvennoy i vseobshchey istorii. Genesis i razvitiye feodalizma v Rossii. Problemy istoriografii. Mezhvuzovskiy sbornik. K 75-letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya prof. V.V. Mavrodina*, ed. Victor A. Ezhov (Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo leningradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, 1983), 13–4.

288 Boris Ya. Ramm, *Papstvo i Rus' v X–XV vv.* (Moscow/Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1959), 51–2.

works on the history and historiography of the Crusades,<sup>289</sup> contributed to the study of the scholarly oeuvre of Vasilii Vasilievskii and to the analysis of the Latin sources for the history of the First Crusade, which mention Pechenegs in Byzantine service.

Vladimir Korolyuk (1921–81) coined the term “contact zone,” which has since taken firm root in Soviet and post-Soviet historiography. It is used, for example, by Igor’ Knyazkiĭ and Georgii Chebotarenko to describe relations between the local population and Turkic nomads in the Dniester-Danube region in the 10th to 13th centuries.<sup>290</sup>

Vladimir Pashuto (1918–83), a student of Boris Grekov, also made forays into the subject of Russo-Byzantine relations. In *The Foreign Policy of Ancient Rus’*, he considered the role of several steppe peoples as both an internal and external factor in interactions between Rus’ and its neighbors. Overall, Pashuto argued that the Rus’ state, pushing Byzantium aside, took the politics of the Steppe in its own hands,<sup>291</sup> and that eventually Byzantium not only lost the ability to use nomads against Rus’, as it had done in the era of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, but also had to seek union with Kyiv against the Pechenegs and Cumans.<sup>292</sup> He surmised that at the end of the 11th century Rus’ and Byzantium had an agreement directed against the Pontic nomads, and that the Cumans became Constantinople’s allies in the latter’s war against the Pechenegs in 1091 thanks to Rus’ mediation.<sup>293</sup>

In today’s Russia, only two historians have written specifically on relations between Byzantium and the nomads of the North Pontic steppes: Igor’

289 Mikhail A. Zaborov, “Krestovyye pokhody v russkoy istoriografii posledney treti XIX v.”; Idem, *Vvedeniye v istoriografiyu krestovykh pokhodov (latinskaya khronografiya XI–XIII vekov)* (Moscow: Nauka, 1966); Idem, *Istoriografiya krestovykh pokhodov (XV–XIX vv.)*.

290 Igor’ O. Knyazkiĭ, “Polovtsy v Dnestrovsko-Karpatskikh zemlyakh i Nizhnem Podunav’ye,” 23. It is worth pointing out, however, that Korolyuk was thinking of socio-economic, rather than “ethnic,” contact zones: Vladimir D. Korolyuk, “O tak nazyvayemoy ‘kontaktnoy zone’ v Yugo-Vostochnoy i Tsentral’noy Yevrope perioda rannego srednevekov’ya,” in *Yugo-Vostochnaya Yevropa v sredniye veka*, 39–45.

291 Vladimir T. Pashuto, *Vneshnyaya politika Drevney Rusi* (Moscow: Nauka, 1968), 88; Idem, “Mesto Drevney Rusi v istorii Yevropy,” in *Feodal’naya Rossiya vo vsemirno-istoricheskom protsesse. (Sbornik statey, posvyashchenny L’vu Vladimirovichu Cherepninu)*, ed. Vladimir T. Pashuto (Moscow: Nauka, 1972), 194–6; Idem, “Mezhdunarodnoye znachenie Drevney Rusi,” in *Istoriya, kul’tura, etnografiya i fol’klor slavyanskikh narodov. IX Mezhdunarodnyy s’yezd slavistov. Kiyev, sentyabr’ 1983 g. Doklady sovetskoy delegatsii*, ed. Lyudmila A. Astafyeva et al. (Kyiv: Nauka, 1983), 54–60.

292 Idem, *Vneshnyaya politika Drevney Rusi*, 64, 83 and 85.

293 Ibid., 87. We should note that the book suffers from a number of inaccuracies in its treatment of Byzantine-nomadic relations in the 11th century. See, for instance, Ibid., 78, 81, 108 and 186.

Knyazkiĭ<sup>294</sup> and Sergeĭ Kozlov.<sup>295</sup> During the 1980s, Knyazkiĭ contributed several pieces on the late nomads of the Dniester-Danube region to collections of essays published under the auspices of the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the MSSR, as well as articles on the same subject to the first volume of the *History of Moldavia*.<sup>296</sup> In 1989, he defended a dissertation on

- 294 Igor' O. Knyazkiĭ, "Polovtsy v Nizhnem Podunav'ye," *VoPis* (2000), no. 3, 121–9; Idem, "Russko-vizantiyskaya voyna 941–944 gg. i Khazariya," in *Khazary. Vtoroy mezhdunarodnyy kollokvium. Tezisy* (Moscow: Institut slavyanovedeniya RAN, 2002), 51–53; Idem, "Konstantinopol' i polovtsy v kontse XII–XIII v.," in *Vizantiya i Zapad (950-letiyе skhizmy khristianskoy tserkvi, 800-letiyе zakhvata Konstantinopolyа krestonosnami). Tezisy dokladov XVII Vserossiyskoy nauchnoy sessii vizantinistov* (Moscow: Institut vseobshchey istorii RAN, 2004), 87–90; Idem, *Rus' i Step'* (Moscow: Nauka, 1996); Idem, *Vizantiya i kochevniki yuzhnorusskikh stepey*.
- 295 Sergeĭ A. Kozlov, "Vizantiyskiye avtory ob uchastii pechenegov v russko-vizantiyskoy voyne 970–971 gg. i ikh istochniki," *Vestnik Tyumenskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta* (2011), no. 2, 33–40; Idem, "Vizantiyskaya traditsiya o posledney vizantino-pechenezhskoy voyne," in *Yevropa: Mezhdunarodnyy al'manakh 10* (2011), 7–22; Idem, "Konstantin Bagryanorodnyy o pechenezhskikh 'femakh' (DAI. cap. 37) i problema yego istochnikov," in *Vostochnaya Yevropa v drevnosti i srednevekov'ye. Migratsii, rasseleniye, voyna kak faktory politogeneza: XXIV Chteniya pamyati V.T. Pashuto* (Moskva, IVI RAN, 18–20.04.2012 g.), ed. Yelena A. Mel'nikova (Moscow: Institut vseobshchey istorii RAN, 2012), 113–20; Idem, "K voprosu o datirovke poyavleniya pechenegov v Nizhnem Podunav'ye," *VizVrem* 71 (2012), 57–73; Idem, "Rassказы L'va Diakona i Skilitsy o bitve Svyatoslava pod Dorostolom (971 g.): fragment utrachennogo vizantiyskogo eposa?" *Stratum plus* (2013), no. 5, 151–60; Idem, "Fol'klor kak istoriya: Ioann Skilitsa o razgrome pechenegov patrikiyem Alakasom," *Elektronnyy nauchno-obrazovatel'nyy zhurnal "Istoriya"* 4–5 (2013). Available at <http://history.jes.su/s207987840000573-9-1>. Accessed on 12 June 2015; Idem, "Bol'she, chem vrag: Osobennosti izobrazheniya pechenegov v vizantiyskoy literature epokhi pervykh Komninov," *BS* 72 (2013), no. 1–2, 145–61; Idem, "Byzantinopecenacica I: Bogas i Kegen – pechenezhskiyе 'yazyki' na vizantiyskoy sluzhbe," *AEMAE* 20 (2013), 103–27; Idem, "More than Enemies. The Description of Nomads in the Byzantine Literature of the Epoch of the First Pecheneg Incursions into Byzantium," in *Rules and Violence/Regeln und Gewalt: On the Cultural History of Collective Violence from Late Antiquity to the Confessional Age*, eds. Cora Dietl and Titus Knäpper (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2014), 83–99; Idem, "Byli li pechenezhskiyе soyuzniki vizantiytsev 'khristolyubivym voinstvom,'" in *Elektronnyy nauchno-obrazovatel'nyy zhurnal "Istoriya"* 11 (2014). Available at <https://history.jes.su/s207987840000954-8-2>. Accessed on 10 January 2022.
- 296 Igor' O. Knyazkiĭ, "O polovetskikh yepiskopiyakh v Karpato-Dunayskikh zemlyakh," in *Sotsial'no-ekonomicheskaya i politicheskaya istoriya Yugo-Vostochnoy Yevropy (do serediny XIX v.)* (Kishinev: Shtiintsa, 1980), 244–51; Idem, "Pis'mennyye istochniki o kochevnikh v Dnestrovsko-Karpatiskikh zemlyakh v XI–XII vv.;" Idem, "Polovtsy v Dnestrovsko-Karpatiskikh zemlyakh i Nizhnem Podunav'ye;" Idem, "Naseleniye Dnestrovsko-Karpatiskikh zemel' i kochevniki v seredine XI–pervoy polovine XIII st.," in *Istoriya Moldavskoy SSR*, vol. 1, *Pervobytnoobshchinnyy stroy. Perekhod k klasovomu*

“The Slavs, Vlachs, and Nomads of the Dniester-Carpathian Lands from the Mid-12th Century to the Mongol-Tatar Invasion.”<sup>297</sup>

Knyazkiĭ's early work built on the classic historiography of the problem, the legacy of which can be seen in the works of V. Vasilevskii, P. Golubovskii, D. Rasovskii, Gy. Moravcsik, and P. Diaconu. He also drew on the research of S. Pletnyova and G. Litavrin and engaged closely with Byzantine sources. In his contribution to *The History of Moldavia*, he set out to make a full use of the archaeological remains discovered in the republic up to the mid-1980s (mainly based on the works of G. Chebotarenko). It is unfortunate that a contributor to such an important collective work did not take into account the works of A. Dobrolyubskii and M. Velikanova, as well as the latest research by Romanian and Bulgarian archaeologists. Perhaps this explains his contradictory statements about the late (mid-11th century) appearance of the main bulk of the Pechenegs on the Lower Danube and the early (1055) dominance of the Cumans there.<sup>298</sup>

Considering the question of interactions between the nomadic and settled inhabitants of the region, Knyazkiĭ notes the presence of remnants of “ancient Rus’ settlements” near areas where nomads regularly passed.<sup>299</sup> In one of his later essays (1988), the scholar contemplates the existence of a “contact zone” between the Slavic and Pecheneg-Tork populations.<sup>300</sup>

In 1996, Knyazkiĭ came out with a book of popular history, *Rus’ and the Steppe*. It was, in a way, a response to the fascination of the Russian *intelligentsia* with Gumilyov's study *Ancient Rus’ and the Great Steppe*. Drawing on the accomplishments of Russian and Soviet historiography, Knyazkiĭ surveyed the shared history of the Eastern Slavs and nomads from the 6th century BC and until the Battle of Kulikovo Field. In its structure and argument, the work resembled *From Kalka to Ugra*, a children's book by Alexandr Degtyarëv and Igor’ Dubov well known to the Soviet public:<sup>301</sup> alone, Rus’ confronts the

---

*obshchestvu. Formirovaniye feodal'nykh otnosheniy. Obrazovaniye Moldavskogo gosudarstva*, eds. Valentin L. Yanin et al. (Kishinev: Cartea Moldovenească, 1987), 247–57.

297 Idem, *Slavyane, volokhi i kochevniki Dnestrovsko-Karpatskikh zemel' (konets IX-ser. XIII vv.)* (Kolomna: Izdaniye Kolomenskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo instituta, 1997). In 1998 Knyazkiĭ defended a doctoral dissertation, “The Ethnic History of the Dniester-Carpathian Lands (9th to Mid-12th Centuries)” (Moscow, 1998).

298 Idem, “Naseleniye Dnestrovsko-Karpats'kikh zemel' i kochevniki v seredine XI–pervoy polovine XIII st.,” 248.

299 Ibid., 253.

300 Knyazkiĭ, “Polovtsy v Dnestrovsko-Karpatskikh zemlyakh i Nizhnem Podunav'ye,” 23.

301 See: Alexandr Degtyarëv and Igor’ Dubov, *Ot Kalki do Ugyr* (Leningrad: Detskaya literatura, 1986).

strongest army in the world, defends civilized Europe against the barbarian onslaught, succumbs for a while under the power of the Mongols, but eventually throws off the so-called Tatar Yoke. Knyazkii's *Byzantium and the Nomads of the South Russian Steppe* (2000) was a sequel (or prequel) to *Rus' and the Steppe*, projecting "the Yoke" back in time and onto a different territory (the Balkans). Also written for the general audience, the book spanned a period from the 9th to the 13th century, but the narrative was rather superficial.

Sergei A. Kozlov, a young scholar from the Russian city of Tyumen, has devoted a number of works to the critical analysis of the source base for the history of Byzantium's relations with the Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans. In his dissertation, he questions the date of the Magyars' expulsion to Pannonia by the Pechenegs (889), derived from the *Reginonis Chronicon*.<sup>302</sup> He also considers such issues as the time of Byzantium's first direct contact with the Pechenegs<sup>303</sup> and sources of information about the Pechenegs found in the *DAI*.<sup>304</sup> Further, Kozlov attempts to establish the sources of the accounts of Leo the Deacon and Ioannes Skylitzes concerning Byzantium's war with Sviatoslav and his allies, including the Pechenegs. In Kozlov's view, Skylitzes based his report on the so-called "text A," composed in the late 10th century and unknown to Leo the Deacon (who, for example, does not mention the Pechenegs among Sviatoslav's allies at all), as well as on Byzantine heroic epic poetry.<sup>305</sup> Kozlov also considers the sources for the problem of

302 In Kozlov's view, the Magyars' expulsion by the Pechenegs and thus their involuntary acquisition of a new homeland took place between the years 893 and 894 and led to the Pecheneg's appearance on the Lower Danube: Sergei A. Kozlov, *Vizantiytsy i tyurkoyazychnyye kochevniki Vostochnoy Yevropy v kontse IX–nachale XIII veka v vizantiyskoy narrativnoy traditsii* [Candidate's thesis] (Tyumen State University, 2012), 35.

303 Kozlov believes that these contacts began no earlier than the 910s: *Ibid.*, 64.

304 Kozlov rejects the idea that the data about the Pechenegs were collected during the reign of Leo VI Sophos and supposes that the source of the *DAI*'s detailed information on the Pechenegs was Ioannes Bogas, a Byzantine official. According to Kozlov, it was in honor of Bogas than Ioannes Kegen received this name in baptism (*Ibid.*, 69; *Idem*, "Konstantin Bagryanorodnyy o pechenezhskikh 'femakh' (*DAI*. cap. 37) i problema yego istochnikov," 118–9), even though Ioannes and Maria were the most common names in the Byzantine prosopography of the 11th and 12th centuries (Jane Baun, "Coming of Age in Byzantium: Agency and Authority in Rites of Passage from Infancy to Adulthood," in *Authority in Byzantium*, ed. Pamela Armstrong (Publications of the Centre for Hellenic Studies, King's College London, 14) (London: Ashgate, 2013), 120). Kozlov considers the subject of Pechenegs in Byzantine service in his article "Byzantinopečenacica I: Bogas i Kegen –pechenezhskiyе 'yazyki' na vizantiyskoy sluzhbe," 103–27.

305 Kozlov, "Vizantiytsy i tyurkoyazychnyye kochevniki Vostochnoy Yevropy v kontse IX–nachale XIII veka v vizantiyskoy narrativnoy traditsii," 89–90; *Idem*, "Fol'klor kak istoriya: Ioann Skilitza o razgrome pechenegov patrikiyem Alakasom."

the Christianization of the Pechenegs,<sup>306</sup> the dating of the events of the Pecheneg-Byzantine war of 1087–91,<sup>307</sup> and the crystallization of the image of the Pechenegs in the Byzantine sources of the 10th to 12th centuries.<sup>308</sup>

Most of the ideas put forward by Kozlov in his 2012 dissertation had been developed in his earlier contributions to scholarly periodicals, but after completing the thesis he has continued his forays into the problem of the representation of the Pechenegs in Byzantine sources. In the article “Folklore and ‘Invading Pechenegs’ on Byzantine and Slavic Miniatures,” analyzing the illustrations to the *Codex Græcus Matritensis Ioannis Skylitzes*, Kozlov demonstrates that the “textual and illustrative series of battle scenes involving the Pechenegs and ‘Scythians’ goes back to the oral tradition.”<sup>309</sup>

The Russian historian of Tajik origin Rustam Shukurov has proposed the concept of “Byzantine Turks.” Exploring the process of the Turkization of the Orthodox world of the Πόντος Εὐξεινος,<sup>310</sup> Shukurov attempts to outline the way the Byzantines viewed various Turkic peoples, including the Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans,<sup>311</sup> and to illuminate the role of these peoples in late Byzantine society in the 13th to 15th centuries.<sup>312</sup>

306 Kozlov believes it was superficial: Idem, *Vizantiŭtsy i tyurkoyazychnyye kochevniki Vostochnoy Yevropy*, 108–17; Idem, “Byli li pechenezhskiyey soyuzniki vizantiŭtsev ‘khris-tolyubivym voinstvom?’”

307 Idem, *Vizantiŭtsy i tyurkoyazychnyye kochevniki Vostochnoy Yevropy*, 120–6.

308 Ibid., 126–43, 156–60.

309 Sergeĭ A. Kozlov, “Folklore and ‘Invading Pechenegs’ on Byzantine and Slavic Miniatures,” in *Actual Problems of Theory and History of Art – 2015: Abstracts of Communications of the 6th International Conference* (Saint Petersburg, 2015), 42.

310 Rustam M. Shukurov, “Between Peace and Hostility: Trebizond and the Pontic Turkish Periphery in the 14th C.,” *Mediterranean Historical Review* 9 (1994), 20–72; Idem, “Tyurki na pravoslavnom Ponte v XIII-XV vv.: nachal’nyy etap tyurkizatsii?” in *Prichernomor’ye v sredniye veka 2* (1995), ed. Sergeĭ P. Karpov, 68–103; Idem, “Eastern Ethnic Elements in the Empire of Trebizond,” in *Acts, 18th International Byzantine Congress, Selected Papers: Main and Communications* (Moscow, 1991), vol. 2, *History, Archaeology, Religion and Theology*, eds. Ihor Ševčenko and Gennadiĭ G. Litavrin, (Shepherdstown: Byzantine Studies Press, 1996), 75–81.

311 Idem, “Zemli i plemena: vizantiyskaya klassifikatsiya tyurok,” *VizVrem* 69 (2010), 151; Idem, *The Byzantine Turks, 1204-1461* (The Medieval Mediterranean, 105) (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2016), 35–7.

312 Idem, “The Byzantine Turks: An Approach to the Study of Late Byzantine Demography,” in *L’Europa dopo la caduta di Costantinopoli: 29 maggio 1453. Atti del XLIV Convegno Storico Internazionale (Todi, 7-9 ottobre 2007)* (Spoleto: Fondazione Centro italiano di studi sull’alto Medioevo, 2008), 73–108; Idem, *The Byzantine Turks, 1204-1461*.

### 3 Oriental Studies

The accomplishments of Eastern European Oriental studies have advanced our understanding of Byzantine-nomadic relations in several areas, such as Turkic linguistics (including historical linguistics), the study of Middle Eastern primary sources for the history of the Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans, and the general theory and history of nomadism.

According to the census of 1959, 23 Turkic ethnic groups lived in the USSR, numbering over 23 million people.<sup>313</sup> This included 123,821 Gagauzes and 49,710 Crimean Tatars<sup>314</sup> (197,768 Gagauzes and 271,715 Crimean Tatars by 1989). Nonetheless, the study of Turkic-speaking peoples was far from a priority for Soviet historians. For instance, the collective work *The Slavs and the East*,<sup>315</sup> published in 1965 under the auspices of the UNESCO, did not even mention medieval nomads. It was as though they constituted a kind of “internal Orient”<sup>316</sup> and thus, unlike the “external” one, did not deserve special attention.

Soviet Turkology went through extended periods of persecution.<sup>317</sup> Despite the fact that the USSR included four national republics of Turkic-speaking peoples, namely the Azerbaijani, Uzbeks, Turkmens, and Kazakhs, Soviet Turkic philology had only one academic periodical, the journal *Soviet Turkology*,

313 Mamedaga Ş. Şirəliyev and Seyfulla G. Əsədullayev, “Sovetskaya tyurkskaya filologiya i zadachi zhurnala ‘Sovetskaya tyurkologiya,’” *Sovetskaya Tyurkologiya* (1970), no. 1, 3.

314 Persecutions against the Crimean Tatars continued even after the deportation. Thus, only in Crimea the census of 1939 registered 218,879 Crimean Tatars, while the census of 1959 found 49,710 in the entire USSR. Such a significant reduction in numbers was in part due to the fact that they were lumped together with the Volga Tatars as simply “Tatars”: Dalkhat Ediev, *Demograficheskiye poteri deportirovannykh narodov* (Stavropol: Agrus, 2003), 241–2.

315 *Slavyane i Vostok*, eds. Mikhail N. Tikhomirov and Babadzan G. Gafurov (Paris: UNESCO, 1965).

316 See: Alexander Etkind, *Internal Colonization. Russia's Imperial Experience* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2011).

317 See: Födör D. Ashnin, Vladimir M. Alpatov and Vladimir M. Nasilov, *Repressirovannaya tyurkologiya* (Moscow: Vostochnaya literatura, 2002). Consider for instance the article by Yelena Zhizhina “On Teaching the History of the Slavic Peoples of the Balkan Peninsula in the Fifth to Eighth Grades of Middle School,” in which the author urges teachers to stress heroic episodes of the Slavic peoples’ struggle against the Turkish occupiers and Russia’s positive role in this struggle: Yelena A. Zhizhina, “O prepodavanii istorii slavyanskikh narodov Balkanskogo poluoostrova v 5-8 klassakh sredney shkoly,” in *Iz istorii balkanskikh stran* (Krasnodar: Krasnodarskiy gosudarstvennyy pedagogicheskiy universitet, 1975), 162–3.



published in Baku from 1970 to 1990.<sup>318</sup> However, work with sources (especially onomastic) was made easier for scholars without special training by the publication of the long-awaited *Ancient Turkic Dictionary* in 1968.<sup>319</sup>

The VDAE brought about some progress not only in the field of “nomadic archaeology,” but also in the study of the languages of the medieval nomads of the North Pontic steppes (see above). Its participant Alexandr Scherbak hypothesized that the marks found on various artifacts discovered by the expedition might be a form of writing.<sup>320</sup> He developed a classification of these signs, offered informative remarks on the genealogy of the study of the Pechenegs and their history, religion, and language in European historiography, and did some original work on the Pecheneg language. He argued that the Pechenegs had their own form of runic writing.<sup>321</sup> After the monograph by Gyula Németh on the Nagyszentmiklós inscriptions, Scherbak’s work was the first systematic study of the Pecheneg language and writing. When Ion Barnea described the runic inscriptions discovered in a church at Basarabi, he noted their resemblance with those analysed by Scherbak.<sup>322</sup> A number of other scholars have addressed this topic in recent years, such as Sergeĭ Klyashtornyi, Valentina Nahapetyan-Flyorova, Igor’ Kyzlasov, and Soslanbek Baĭchorov.<sup>323</sup>

318 This journal published philological and historical-ethnographic articles by Andreĭ Kononov and Mikhail Guboglo, important for the subject of this book: Andreĭ N. Kononov, “Makhmud Kashgarskiy i yego ‘Divanu lugat it-tyurk’,” *Sovetskaya Tyurkologiya* (1972), no. 1, 3–17; Mikhail N. Guboglo, “Gagauzskaya antroponimika kak etnogeneticheskiy istochnik,” *Sovetskaya Tyurkologiya* (1973), no. 2, 84–92. The journal currently continues under the title *Türkologiya* but has limited circulation.

319 *Drevnetyurkskiy slovar’*, eds. Vladimir M. Nadelyaev et al. (Leningrad: Nauka, 1968).

320 Scherbak, “Znaki na keramike i kirpichakh iz Sarkela – Beloy Vezhi (K voprosu o yazyke i pis’mennosti pechenegov),” 362.

321 *Ibid.*, 385–388. See also: Alexandr M. Scherbak, *Tyurkskaya runika: proiskhozheniye drevneyshey pis’mennosti tyurok, granitsy yeyo rasprostraneniya i osobennosti ispol’zovaniya* (Saint Petersburg: Nauka, 2001).

322 Barnea, “Predvaritel’nyye svedeniya o kamennykh pamyatnikakh v Basarabi (Obl. Dobrodzha),” 313. Later, Edward Tryjarski joined Barnea in attributing the inscriptions to the Pechenegs, but Bulgarian historians generally incline towards seeing these, as well as many other nomadic artifacts, as Proto-Bulgarian. See: Beševliev, “Beobachtungen über die protobulgarischen Inschriften bei Basarabi-Murfatlar,” 50–7.

323 Sergeĭ G. Klyashtornyi, *Istoriya Tsentral’noy Azii i pamyatniki runicheskogo pis’m’a* (Saint Petersburg: Filologicheskii fakul’tet SPbGU, 2003); Igor’ L. Kyzlasov, “Runicheskiye nadpisi Mayatskogo gorodishcha,” in *Mayatskiy arkhologicheskii kompleks. Materialy sovsenko-bolgaro-vengerskoy ekspeditsii*, ed. Svetlana A. Pletnyova (Moscow: Nauka, 1990), 10–40; Igor’ L. Kyzlasov, *Runicheskiye pis’mennosti yevraziyskikh stepey* (Moscow: Izdatel’skaya firma “Vostochnaya literatura” RAN, 1994); Valentina E. Nakhapetyan, “Graffiti Mayatskogo gorodishcha,” in *Mayatskiy arkhologicheskii kompleks. Materialy*

Turkologists Nikolai Baskakov (1905–95),<sup>324</sup> Andrei Kononov (1906–86),<sup>325</sup> Igor' Dobrodomov,<sup>326</sup> and Valerii Bushakov (1942–2013)<sup>327</sup> wrote on the ethnonymy and anthroponymy of the medieval nomads of Eurasia and on nomad-related geographical names, which were numerous in Moldavia, Crimea, and the North Pontic steppes before their incorporation into the Russian Empire. For instance, in Budjak there were at least ten toponyms deriving from the tribal (or ethnic) name Qıpçaq,<sup>328</sup> while in Crimea Valerii Bushakov counted 26 oikonyms based on the word “Qıpçaq” (including Mount Qıpçaq on the Tarhanqut Peninsula), one based on the word “Biçenek” (the villages of

---

*sovetsko-bolgaro-vengerskoy ekspeditsii*, 41–91; Soslanbek Ya. Baichorov, *Drevnetyurkskiye runicheskiye pamyatniki Yevropy: Otnosheniye severokavkazskogo areala drevnetyurkskoy pis'mennosti k volgo-donskomu i dunayskomu arealam* (Stavropol: Stavropol'skoye knizhnoye izdatel'stvo, 1989). Igor' Kyzlasov recently attempted a new review and systematization of the entire corpus of steppe runic writing in Eurasia. He sets aside the inscriptions from Murfatlar and Nagyszentmiklós as separate “Murfatlar” and “Tisza” groups without ethnic attribution, rejecting their interpretation as Pecheneg. In his view, the runic inscriptions in Murfatlar are Christian cryptograms, and those on the bowls from the Nagyszentmiklós hoard should be dated to the 8th century AD, that is, long before the Pechenegs' arrival in Europe: Igor' L. Kyzlasov, *Türkic scripts (summary)*. Available at <https://bit.ly/3HKDQuT>. Accessed on 10 January 2022.

- 324 Nikolai A. Baskakov, “Rodoplemennyye nazvaniya kypchakov v toponimii Yuzhnoy Moldavii,” in *Toponimika Vostoka: Novyye issledovaniya* (Moscow: Nauka, 1964), 46–50; Idem, “Mikroetnonimiy uzov (oguzov) – chernykh klobukov v russkikh letopisyakh,” *Acta Orientalia ASH* 36 (1982), no. 1–3, 39–46; Idem, “Etnonimy i antroponimy pechenegov,” in *Studia turcologica memoriae Alexii Bombaci dicata*, eds. Aldo Gallotta and Ugo Marazzi (Seminario di Studi Asiatici, Series Minor, 19) (Naples: Istituto Universitario Orientale, 1982), 12–22; Idem, “Antroponimy i etnonimy drevnikh tyurkov Vostochnoy Yevropy (tipy i modeli),” in *Balkansko ezikoznanie* 38 (1985), no. 4, 63–5; Idem. “Slovo o polku Igoreve' i drevniye tyurki Vostochnoy Yevropy,” *RO* 48 (1993), no. 2, 52–75.
- 325 Andrei N. Kononov, “K etimologiyi etnonimov kypchak, kuman, kumyk,” *UJ* 48 (1976), 159–66.
- 326 Igor' G. Dobrodomov, “O polovetskikh etnonimakh v drevnerusskoy literature,” in *Tyurkologicheskyy sbornik (1975)*, ed. Andrei N. Kononov (Moscow: Nauka, 1978), 102–29.
- 327 Valerii A. Bushakov, *Tyurkskaya Etnooykonimiya Kryma. Dissertatsiya na soiskaniye uchenoy stepeni kandidata filologicheskikh nauk* [Manuscript] (Moscow, 1992); Idem, *Leksychnyy sklad istorichnoyi toponimiyi Krymu* (Kyiv: Instytut skhodoznavstva im. A.Yu. Kryms'koho, 2003). See also: Henryk Jankowski, *A Historical-Etymological Dictionary of pre-Russian Habitation Names of the Crimea* (Handbook of Oriental Studies, Section 8 Uralic & Central Asian Studies, 15) (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2006).
- 328 Andrii V. Shabashov, “Tsentral'noaziatskiye drevnosti Budzhaka (k voprosu o sootnoshenii rodoplemennogo sostava nogaytsev Budzhakskoy Ordy i gosudarstva kochevykh uzbekov),” in *Lukomor'ya: arkheolohiya, etnolohiya, istoriya Pivnichno-Zakhidnoho Prychornomor'ya* 1 (2007), 19–20.

Biçenak and Çabi),<sup>329</sup> and a number of toponyms deriving from Cuman clan names (for instance, Toqsaba).<sup>330</sup>

Despite the fact that the Soviet Union occupied a huge territory and held a vast assemblage of ethnic groups within its borders, “Soviet history” as a history of statehood centered on the progression “Kyivan Rus’ – Muscovy – Russia – the USSR.” As a result, Soviet Orientalists, in keeping with a long-standing Russian tradition, often ignored the Pechenegs, Oghuzes, and Cumans in their study and publication of Asian and Middle Eastern sources for medieval history, focusing their efforts on the Slavs and the Rus’.<sup>331</sup> The history of these medieval nomads was viewed primarily through the lens of their contacts with Rus’.<sup>332</sup>

329 Bushakov, *Leksychnyy sklad istorichnoyi toponimiyi Krymu*, 125, 191 and 220. Henryk Jankowski states that the bulk of Crimean oikonyms are Kipchak (A. Sárközi, “[Review of:] Jankowski, Henryk, *A Historical-Etymological Dictionary of pre-Russian Habitation Names of the Crimea*. Leiden – Boston, Brill, 2006, X, 1298 pages, 60 illustrations (Handbook of Oriental Studies. Section Eight, Central Asia, Volume 15). ISBN 0169–8524,” *Acta Orientalia ASH* 61 (2008), no. 3, 387).

330 Historical toponymics, however, can only be used in reconstructing the events of the 10th and 11th centuries with great caution, because the detailed maps and descriptions (containing names of communities) that historians and linguists rely on date from the late 18th and early 19th centuries (for Moldavia it is, for instance, *Carte de la Moldavie pour servir à l’histoire militaire de la guerre entre les Russes et les Turcs: Levée par l’Etat Major sous la direction de F.G. Bawr. Echelle de 10 heures de la Moldavie* (Amsterdam, 1775); for Crimea – the so-called *Kameral’noye opisaniye Kryma*, in *Izvestiya Tavricheskoy uchenoy arkhivnoy komissii, 1887–1889*). Turkic tribes first appeared in Crimea and the North Pontic steppes in the era of the Huns. The Bulgars inhabited these regions before the Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans. A conglomerate of peoples of the Golden Horde occupied them afterwards. The Nogais lived there immediately before the coming of the Russian Empire. Two points need to be taken into account. First, an important part of the nomadic Turkic peoples’ life was their clan and tribal organization that changed very little over time, since membership in a clan, or “tamga,” was passed down the male line. Second, the same clan could often be part of several different nomadic peoples, and the latter were often distinguished based on the proportions of various clans in their makeup (the clans of Qalmaq, Qungurat, and Qıpçaq were very ubiquitous). Hence, it is very difficult to know when this or that Turkic toponym made its first appearance in a particular region. Ethnic toponyms deriving from the word “Qıpçaq” are a case in point. They may have been introduced into Crimea and the North Pontic steppes during the 11th to 13th centuries, when the Cumans-Kipchaks dominated the region, but could also date from the later times of the Nogais (15th to 18th centuries) – there may have been Kipchak immigrants from the Fergana Valley or the territory of today’s Kazakhstan among the Nogais. See: Shabashov, “Tsentral’noaziatskiye drevnosti Budzhaka.” One of the noble clans among the Crimean Tatars bore the name of Qıpçaq (Bushakov, *Leksychnyy sklad istorichnoyi toponimiyi Krymu*, 45).

331 The Russian Orientalist Avraam/Albert Harkavy (1835–1919) may be considered the founder of this tradition.

332 See, for instance, *Kıyevskaya Rus’ i kochevniki*.

For the same reason, works of Soviet historians dealing with medieval nomadic history outside of the archaeology and history of Rus' are rare and difficult to find. Among the few authors who have written on this subject, we can name Sergeĭ Tolstov, Serzhan Akhinzhanov, Sergeĭ Agadzhanov,<sup>333</sup> Zurab Anchabadze,<sup>334</sup> and Rauf Guseĭnov.<sup>335</sup>

Based on his work as one of the directors of the Khwarezm Expedition of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, which was launched in 1937, Sergeĭ Tolstov (1907–76) published the book *In the Footsteps of the Ancient Khwarezmian Civilization*.<sup>336</sup> Considering the foreign policy of the Khwarezm-Shahs, he surmised that the Russo-Pecheneg war of 988–997 had to do with the process of Islamization among the Pechenegs under the influence of Khwarezmian missionaries. In his view, this phenomenon enabled the Shahs to use the nomads to push Rus' away from the Volga trade route.<sup>337</sup> In his article “Towns of the Ghuzzes,” Tolstov argued that the Oghuzes and Pechenegs were familiar with sedentary life, knew fishing, and had towns even before their migration to Europe;<sup>338</sup> the poor among the Pechenegs and Oghuzes led a settled life, and the rich were nomads. It was class struggle between them that caused the relocation of large groups of pastoralist aristocracy to Khwarezm, Transoxiana, Khorasan, Rus', and Byzantium.<sup>339</sup>

The Kazakh scholar Serzhan Akhinzhanov (1939–91) defended a dissertation on “The Kipchaks and Their Political Relations with Khwarezm in the 11th to Early 13th Centuries” in 1973 and went on to author a number of works on the pre-European period in the history of the Cumans-Kipchaks, including a historiographical overview.<sup>340</sup> Today, the Kipchaks are studied by the

333 Sergeĭ G. Agadzhanov, *Ocherki istorii oguzov i turkmen Sredney Azii IX-XIII vv.* (Ashgabat: Ylym, 1969); Idem, “Nekotoryye problemy istorii oguzskikh plemen Sredney Azii,” in *Tyurkologicheskĭy sbornik* (1970), eds. Andreĭ N. Kononov et al. (Moscow: Nauka, 1970), 192–207.

334 Zurab V. Anchabadze, “Kypchaki Severnogo Kavkaza, po dannym gruzinskikh letopisey XI–XIV vekov,” in *O proiskhozhdenii balkartsev i karachayevtsev*, eds. Ilya V. Treskov et al. (Nalchik: Kabardino-balkarskoye knizhnoye izdatel'stvo, 1960), 113–26.

335 Rauf A. Guseĭnov, “Siriyskiye istochniki po istorii Vizantii XI–XII vv.,” *VizVrem* 33 (1972), 120–8; Idem, “Tyurkskiye etnicheskiye gruppy XI–XII vv. v Zakavkaz'ye,” in *Tyurkologicheskĭy sbornik* (1972), eds. Andreĭ N. Kononov et al. (Moscow: Nauka, 1973), 375–81.

336 Sergeĭ P. Tolstov, *Po sledam drevnekhozremiyskoy tsivilizatsii* (Moscow/Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1948).

337 Ibid., 262.

338 Idem, “Goroda guzov (istoriko-etnograficheskiye etyudy),” *SovEthn* (1947), no. 3, 100.

339 Ibid., 101.

340 Serzhan M. Akhinzhanov, “Iz istorii dvizheniya kochevykh plemon yevraziyskikh stepey v pervoy polovine XI veka,” in *Arkheologicheskĭye issledovaniya drevnego i srednevekovogo*

Kazakh historian Nursen Kuzembaev.<sup>341</sup> Ayman Dosymbayeva and Myrzatay Zholdasbekov have made interesting observations regarding the influence of Byzantine art on the funerary sculpture of the nomads of the northern Black Sea steppes and Kazakhstan.<sup>342</sup>

The Perestroika that began in the USSR in 1985 and the subsequent demise of the Soviet Union removed the artificial limitations (spoken or unspoken)<sup>343</sup> on the study of the political history of medieval nomads. While previously the community of researchers working in this field was limited to the Turkic-speaking republics of the USSR,<sup>344</sup> more “Slav” scholars became active in it after 1985 – among them Sergeĭ Klyashtornyi (who had until then mostly concerned himself with the problem of runic inscriptions),<sup>345</sup> Oleg Bubenok,<sup>346</sup> Sergeĭ Romashov,<sup>347</sup> and Oleksandr Tortika.<sup>348</sup>

---

*Kazakhstan*, ed. Kemal' A. Akishev, (Almaty: Nauka KazSSR, 1980), 46–53; Serzhan M. Akhinzhanov, *Kypchaki v istorii srednevekovogo Kazakhstana*; Idem, *Kipchaki v X–XIII vv. Istoriograficheskiy obzor*. Available at <https://bit.ly/3HPWzFB>. Accessed on 10 January 2022.

- 341 Nursen E. Kuzembaev, “Izucheniye kipchakskoy problematiki v istoricheskoy nauke Rossii v XVIII–kontse XX vekov,” *AEMAE* 18 (2011), 157–98; Idem, “Kipchakskiy ‘duruty’, ‘tertrobichi’ i ‘tertery’ v istorii Yevrazii,” in *Central Eurasia in the Middle Ages. Studies in Honour of Peter B. Golden*, eds. István Zimonyi and Osman Karatay (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2016), 223–34; Idem, “Khan Kotyan i yego potomki v istorii Kiyevskoy Rusi, Vengrii, Bolgarii i Vizantii v pervoy polovine XIII veka,” in *Velikite Asenevtsi. Sbornik s dokladi ot konferentsiya, posvetena na 830 godini ot vustanieto na bratyata Petür i Asen, nachaloto na vtoroto Bülgarsko tsarstvo i obyavyavaneto na Tyrново za stolitsa na Bülgariya i 780 godini ot legitimnoto vüzbornyavane na Bülgarskata Patriarshiya* (Veliko Tarnovo: Abagar, 2016), 199–204.
- 342 Myrzatay Zholdasbekov and Ayman Dosymbayeva, “Tyurkskiye plemena kazakhskoy stepi i Vizantiya,” in *Trudy mezhdunarodnoy nauchno-prakticheskoy konferentsii “Tsentral'naya Aziya i Kazakhstan: istoki tyurkskoy tsivilizatsii.” 25-26 maya, 2006 g.*, vol. 1, eds. Mahmetgali Sarybekov et al. (Taraz, 2006), 7–11.
- 343 See: Oleksii V. Komar, “Khozars'kyy kahanat i rann'oseredn'ovichna nomadistyka: zaver-shennyya epokhy,” *ADIU* (2010), no. 1, 137.
- 344 Serzhan Akhinzhanov is an ethnic Kazakh, Sergeĭ Agadzhanov – Turkmen, and Rauf Guseinov – Azerbaijani.
- 345 Sergeĭ G. Klyashtornyi and Tursun I. Sultanov, *Gosudarstva i narody Yevraziyskikh stepey. Drevnost' i srednevekov'ye* (Saint Petersburg: Orientalia, 2000).
- 346 Oleg B. Bubenok, *Yasy i brodniki v stepyakh Vostochnoy Yevropy (VI–nachalo XIII vv.)* (Kyiv: Logos, 1997); Idem, “Etnichnyy sklad osiloho naseleennyya prykhornomors'kykh stepiv naprykintsii X–pochatku XIII st.,” *Ukrayina v Tsentral'no-Skhidnyy Yevropi* 2 (2002), 14–37.
- 347 Sergeĭ A. Romashov, “The Pechenegs in Europe in the 9th–10th Centuries,” *RO* 52 (1999), 21–35.
- 348 Olexandr O. Tortika, *Severo-Zapadnaya Khazariya v kontekste istorii Vostochnoy Yevropy (vtoraya polovina VII–pervaya chetvert' X v.)* (Kharkiv: Kharkiv's'ka derzhavna akademiya kul'tury, 2006).

As a result of the military and, later on, cultural and economic expansion of the Arab Caliphate into the North Caucasus, Central Asia, and the Volga-Don region, a considerable amount of intelligence about the peoples of these regions circulated in Arabic (and later Persian and Turkic) literature. Arab authors were generally not in the habit of acknowledging their sources, because plagiarism was not condemned in the early Middle Ages,<sup>349</sup> and thus different authors routinely replicated and often distorted the same information. In 1932, the Russian Arabist Ignatiĭ Krachkovskii (1883–1951) proposed to create a compendium of the Arabic testimony on “the peoples of the USSR,”<sup>350</sup> but this idea was never realized as a coherent project or series. At different times, Russian, Ukrainian, and Kazakh scholars published Oriental sources relating to the history of medieval nomads. Examples of this research trajectory can be found in the works of Boris Zakhoder,<sup>351</sup> Anatolii Novosel'tsev,<sup>352</sup> Oleg Bolshakov,<sup>353</sup> Tatyana Kalinina,<sup>354</sup> Irina Konovalova,<sup>355</sup> Andrii Kovalivs'kyi,<sup>356</sup>

- 
- 349 Boris N. Zakhoder, *Kaspiyskiy svod svedeniy o Vostochnoy Yevrope*, vol. 2, *Bulgary, mad'yary, narody Severa, pechenegi, rusy, slavyane* (Moscow: Nauka, 1967), 182.
- 350 Tatyana M. Kalinina, *Svedeniya rannikh uchenykh Arabskogo khalifata: Teksty, perevod, kommentariy* (Moscow: Nauka, 1988), 5.
- 351 Boris N. Zakhoder, *Kaspiyskiy svod svedeniy o Vostochnoy Yevrope*, vol. 1, *Gorgan i Povolzh'ye v IX-X vv.* (Moscow: Nauka, 1962); vol. 2, *Bulgary, mad'yary, narody Severa, pechenegi, rusy, slavyane*. Because Arab authors often reused each other's (and even Roman authors') writings, Boris Zakhoder did not reproduce fragments of original texts, but instead grouped them based on subjects, peoples, and countries. Hansgerd Göckenjan and István Zimonyi employed the same subject-people approach in their *Orientalische Berichte über die Völker Osteuropas*.
- 352 Anatolii P. Novosel'tsev, “Vostochnyye istochniki o vostochnykh slavyanakh i Rusi VI–X vv.,” in *Drevnerusskoye gosudarstvo i yego mezhdunarodnoye znacheniyе*, eds. Anatolii P. Novosel'tsev et al. (Moscow: Nauka, 1965), 397–408.
- 353 *Puteshestviye Abu Khamida al-Garnati v Vostochnuyu i Tsentral'nuyu Yevropu (1131–1153 gg.)*, ed., transl., comment. Oleg G. Bolshakov, hist. comment. Alexandr L. Monheit (Moscow: Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury, 1971).
- 354 Kalinina, *Svedeniya rannikh uchenykh Arabskogo khalifata: Teksty, perevod, kommentariy*.
- 355 Irina G. Konovalova, “Arabskiye istochniki XII–XIV vv. po istorii Karpato-Dnestrovskikh zemel',” in *Drevneyshiyе gosudarstva na territorii SSSR: Materialy i issledovaniya. 1990 g.*, ed. Anatolii P. Novosel'tsev. (Moscow: Nauka, 1991), 5–115; Eadem, *Vostochnaya Yevropa v sochinenii al-Idrisi* (Moscow: Izdatel'skaya firma “Vostochnaya literatura” RAN, 1999).
- 356 Andrii P. Kovalevskii, *Kniga Akhmeda ibn-Fadlana o yego puteshestvii na Volgu v 921–922 gg.*

Wolf Beilis,<sup>357</sup> Victor Kryukov,<sup>358</sup> and Zifa-Alua Auezova.<sup>359</sup> The publication of primary sources stimulated further research and interpretation.<sup>360</sup>

The Soviet Union inherited from the Russian Empire immense Asian territories inhabited by many nomadic ethnic groups. Their economy and way of life did not fit the theory of classes. In the 1930s, the Soviet government

- 357 Wolf M. Beilis, "Svedeniya o Chornom more v sochineniyakh arabskikh geografov IX–X vv.," in *Blizhniy i Sredny Vostok*, ed. Avrora I. Falina (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Vostochnoy literatury, 1962), 21–8; Idem, "Narody Vostochnoy Yevropy v kratkom opisaniy Mutakhhkhara al-Makdisi (X v.)," in *Vostochnyye istochniki po istorii narodov Yugo-Vostochnoy i Tsentral'noy Yevropy*, vol. 2, ed. Anna S. Tvertinova, (Moscow: Nauka, 1969), 304–311; Idem, "Al-Idrisi (XII v.) o Vostochnom Prichernomor'ye i yugo-vostochnoy okraine russkikh zemel'," in *Drevneyshiye gosudarstva na territorii SSSR (1982)*, ed. Anatolii P. Novosel'tsev (Moscow: Nauka, 1984), 208–28; Idem, "Krayina al-Kumaniya u 'Heohrafichnomu tvorii' al-Idrisi ta Polovets'ka zemlya Ipatiyivs'koho litopysu," in *Mappa Mundi: Zbirnyk naukovykh prats' na poshanu Yaroslava Dashkevycha z nahody yoho 70-richchya*, eds. Igor Gerych et al. (Lviv/Kyiv/NewYork: M.P. Kots, 1996), 84–104.
- 358 Victor G. Kryukov, *Al-Khuvarizmi pro 'Sarmatiyu – zemlyu burdzhaniy' ta susidni z neyu 'krayiny'* (Luhans'k: Luhans'kyy natsional'nyy universytet imeni Tarasa Shevchenka, 2009).
- 359 Makhmud al-Kashgari, *Divan Lugat at-Turk*, transl., preface and comment. Zifa-Alua M. Auezova (Almaty: Dayk Press, 2005).
- 360 Tatyana M. Kalinina, "Genealogii vostochnoyevropeyskikh narodov v istoricheskom soznaniy srednevekovykh arabskikh pisateley," in *Drevneyshiye gosudarstva Vostochnoy Yevropy (2002). Genealogiya kak forma istoricheskoy pamyati*, ed. Yelena A. Mel'nikova (Moscow: Vostochnaya literatura, 2004), 102–13; Eadem, "Dneprovsko-Donskoy basseyn v predstavleniyakh arabo-persidskikh geografov IX–X vv.," *Khazariskiy al'manakh* 6 (2007), 106–19; Eadem, "Pechenegi i put' iz Urgenchy k nim," in *Drevneyshiye gosudarstva Vostochnoy Yevropy (2009). Transkontinental'nyye i lokal'nyye puti kak sotsiokul'turnyy fenomen*, ed. Tatyana N. Jackson (Moscow: Indrik, 2010), 96–109; Eadem, "Vostochnaya Yevropa v 'obrazye mira' arabskoy srednevekovoy geografii," *Istoriya nauk o Zemle (2009)*, 102–8; Eadem, "Granitsy pechenegov po 'Anonimnoy zapiske,'" in *Vostochnaya Yevropa v drevnosti i srednevekov'ye*, 21, eds. Yelena A. Mel'nikova et al. (Moscow: Nauka, 2009), 119–125; "Khudud al-'Alam' o granitsakh pechenegov," in *Istochniki po istorii kochevnikov*, 54–6; Roman P. Khrapachevskii, *Polovtsy-kuny v Volgo-Ural'skom mezhdurech'ye* (Moscow: TSIVOI, 2013); Irina G. Konovalova, "Political Geography of the 10th Century: Representation of World Empires in Arab Geography," in *XV. International Conference of Historical Geographers. 6.–10. 8. 2012. Prague, Czechia, Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Science. Book of Abstracts* (Prague: Institute of History of the Czech Academy of Sciences, 2012), 166–7; Dmitrii M. Nasilov, "Kypchaki u Makhmuda Kashgarskogo," in *Tyurkologicheskyy sbornik 2007-2008: istoriya i kul'tura tyurkskikh narodov Rossii i sopredel'nykh stran*, eds. Sergei G. Klyashporniy et al. (Moscow: Vostochnaya literatura, 2009), 284–93; Gennadii N. Garustovich, "Rasprostraneniye islama u pechenegov v stepyakh Vostochnoy Evropy," *Vestnik Akademii nauk Respubliki Bashkortostan* 18 (2013), no. 3, 66–75; Idem, "Proniknoveniye khristianstva k tyurkoyazychnym kochevnikam – pechenegam v epokhu srednevekov'ya," *Problemy vostokovedeniya* 59 (2013), no. 1, 32–8, etc.

launched a cruel experiment forcing nomadic peoples, including the Kyrgyz, Kazakhs, Buryat-Mongols, and others, into sedentary life, which triggered a mass famine.<sup>361</sup>

After 1945, nomadic pastoralism continued to be practiced in the USSR, but only as part of collectivized agriculture, on collective farms (*kolkhozes*). In the early 1950s, the new, post-Stalinist government launched a so-called Virgin Land Campaign (*osvoyeniye tseliny*), the goal of which was to bring under cultivation vast stretches of land on the right bank of the Volga, in the North Caucasus, Western Siberia, and Northern Kazakhstan – that is, regions where nomadic pastoralism was widely practiced. As was usually the case in the Socialist camp, mere practical measures were not enough. It was imperative to establish a Marxist-Leninist theoretical basis for any government program. In this particular instance, the nomadic way of life had to be declared an anachronism, and transition to farming had to be justified. Paradoxically, the Soviet regime's policy of forced sedentarization gave an initial impetus to systematic study of nomadism in the USSR.<sup>362</sup>

361 Nikolai A. Ivanitzkii, *Kollektivizatsiya i raskulachivaniye: nachalo 30-kh godov* (Moscow: Interpraks, 1996), 218; Isabelle Oyahon, *La sédentarisation des Kazakhs dans l'URSS de Staline: Collectivisation et changement social (1928-1945)* (Paris: Maisonneuve et Larose, 2006), 174–5.

362 In 1954, a conference of Soviet Orientalists was held in Tashkent, dedicated to the so-called “pre-October” (i.e., before the “October Revolution” in Russia) history of Central Asia and Kazakhstan. One of the main problems the conference focused on was the nature of socio-economic relations among nomads. The Iranist Iosif Braginskii suggested the following scheme, which corresponded to the Marxist “stages of history”: until the 6th century BC, slavery was prevalent, and after that the feudal formation persisted until 1917: Alfrid K. Bustanov, *Soviet Orientalism and the Creation of Central Asian Nations* (New York: Routledge, 2014), 62–3. A different view was put forward by Sergali Tolybekov. Director of the Institute of Economics of the Academy of Sciences of the Kazakh SSR. He argued that the nomadic economy was not “feudal” in the Marxist-Leninist sense of the term, and that nomads were not familiar with the feudal ownership of land. Tolybekov proposed to distinguish three forms of the nomadic economy: nomadic proper, or “camp,” implying a total absence of farming and sedentary life; semi-nomadic, in which permanent winter camps and the partial provision of fodder for young livestock and bred horses are practiced; and semi-nomadic with a parallel development of farming and sedentary life. Specific systems of social relations correspond to each of these forms: *ayil*-communal relations to the first and second forms and class relations to the third. (An *ayil* is a nomadic family group the members of which may live in the same yurt, or a settlement of the nomadic or semi-nomadic type consisting of relatives and kin.) Sergei Rudenko later built on Tolybekov's ideas, trying to demonstrate evolutionary transitions from one “form” to another. Gennadii Markov (former *SMERSH* agent) traced the passing of settled pastoralists from the pastoral rearing of cattle to semi-sedentary, or even to “camp,” nomadism. These scholars' arguments provided the methodological basis for S. Pletnyova's work in this field. See: Pletnyova, *Kochevniki Srednevekov'ya. Poisk istoricheskikh zakonmernostey*,



Lev Gumilyov (1912–92) is well known for his contributions to this field. Among his more than 200 scholarly works, some touch on the problem of the trans-Danubian Turks' relations with Byzantium, including two books: *Ancient Rus' and the Great Steppe* and *A Millennium around the Caspian Sea*.<sup>363</sup> However, the real value of Gumilyov's oeuvre is historiosophic rather than narrowly factual. He succeeded not only in drawing academic attention to the role of geography and the environment in nomadic life (see above), but also in "rehabilitating" the nomads in general in the eyes of Soviet historical scholarship. He is often considered a supporter and champion of the cause of Eurasianism.<sup>364</sup>

The study of nomadism in general and individual aspects of nomadic life in particular<sup>365</sup> retains its strong position in Eastern European historiography.<sup>366</sup> As demonstrated by the works of the Kharkiv historian Oleksandr Tortika (1967–2015), interdisciplinary methods can be very productive in this field.<sup>367</sup> Tortika proposed a radically new approach to calculating the size of the nomadic population of a region, based on estimating the total area of available winter pastures. Such estimates allow us to assess the limits on the number of cattle the nomads could keep. Taking into account the human body's dietary needs, we can thus arrive at the maximum possible nomadic population in the ecosystem in question. Tortika used his methodology to calculate

---

9–10. See also: Gennadiĭ E. Markov, "Iz istorii izucheniya nomadizma v otechestvennoy literature: voprosy teorii," *Vostok* (1998), no. 6, 110–23.

363 Lev N. Gumilyov, *Tsyacheletiyе vokrug Kaspiya* (Baku: Azernesh, 1991); Idem, *Drevnyaya Rus' i Velikaya Step'* (Moscow: AST, 1989).

364 This point, however, has been disputed by Marlène Laruelle: Marlène Laruelle, "Kogda prisvaivayetsya intelektual'naya sobstvennost', ili O protivopolozhnosti L.N. Gumileva i P.I. Savitskogo," *Acta Eurasica* (2001), no. 4, 5–19.

365 For instance, since nomads repeatedly crossed the Danube and other waterways, studies on this subject can be of great interest: Nikolai P. Ivlev and Mikhail N. Ivlev, "River Crossings and Bridges of Nomads," *Central Asian Survey* 13 (1994), no. 3, 417–24; Olexandr O. Tortika, "Preodoleniye vodnykh pregrad kochevymi narodami Yevrazii I–II tys. n.e.," *Visnyk Kharkiv's'koho derzhavnogo universytetu* 441 (1999), no. 31, 32–44. Cf.: Denis Sinor, "On Water Transport in Central Eurasia," *UAI* 33 (1961), 156–79.

366 Anatolii M. Khazanov, *Nomads and the Outside World* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1994); Kateryna P. Bunyatyan, "Skotarstvo ta sposib zhyttya," *Arkheolohiya* (1997), no. 3, 32–9; Nikolai N. Kradin, "Kochevniki i zemledel'cheskiy mir," *Vostok* 3 (2000), 5–16; Idem, "Kochevyie imperii: genezis, rastsvet, upadok," *Vostok* 5 (2001), 21–32; Eleonora S. L'vova, "Vzaimodeystviye kochevnikov i zemledel'tsev: afrikanskiy variant," *Vostok* 4 (2001), 39–47; Nurbolat E. Masanov, *Kochevaya tsivilizatsiya kazakhov* (Moscow/Almaty: Gorizont/Sotsinvest, 1995).

367 On Oleksandr Tortika, see: Victor S. Aksenov, Svitlana V. Yevsieenko and Victor M. Ryapolov, "Pamyati A.A. Tortiki," *Khazarskiy al'manakh* 14 (2016), 401–10.

the approximate population of Old Great Bulgaria in the 7th century AD.<sup>368</sup> His works are representative of a new trend in scholarship – demographic modeling in archaeology.<sup>369</sup> He contributed to the development of the methods of ecological and demographic reconstruction in the study of traditional Eurasian nomadic societies.

Today, studies in the history and ethnography of nomadic peoples appear in such journals as *The Archaeology, Ethnography, and Anthropology of Eurasia* (Novosibirsk), *Oriens-Vostok* and *The Ethnographic Review* (Moscow), *Tatar Archaeology* (Kazan), *The Golden Horde Review* (Kazan) and others. In Kyiv, the publication of the journal *The Oriental World* was restarted in 1993.

The years immediately before and after the disintegration of the USSR also witnessed the rise and proliferation of so-called “alternative historiography.”<sup>370</sup> Small (compared to mainstream), mostly ethnic interest groups began to assert their own visions of their history. Their spokesmen built narratives centering on such key moments as the gaining of a homeland, the emergence and flourishing of a nation-state, great conquests, and eventually a terrible catastrophe that interrupted the nation’s gradual progress.

Two points stand out when we consider, for instance, the book by the journalist of Gagauz descent Fëdor Angeli *Essays in the History of the Gagauzes – Descendants of the Oghuzes (Mid-8th to Early 21st Centuries)*,<sup>371</sup> the Kyrgyz author Rustam Abdumanapov’s *The Kipchaks in the Ethnogenesis of*

368 Olexandr O. Tortika, Volodymyr K. Mikheyev and Roman I. Kortiyev, “Nekotoryye ekologo-demograficheskiye i sotsial’nyye aspekty istorii kochevykh obshchestv,” *EthnOboz* (1994), no. 1, 49–61; Olexandr O. Tortika, “Sredniye razmery stada kak osnovnoy ekologicheskoy, ekonomicheskoy i sotsial’nyy pokazatel’ traditsionnogo kochevogo obshchestva,” *Aktual’ni problemy vitchyznyanoyi ta vsesvitn’oyi istoriyi* 3 (1998), 168–74; Idem, “Ekologicheskii vozmozhnaya chislennost’ kochevogo naseleniya Velikoy Bolgarii (Staroy Bolgarii, Bolgarii Kubrata) – vtoraya-tret’ya chetvert’ VII v. n.e.,” in *Sugdeya, Surozh, Soldayya v istorii i kul’ture Rusi-Ukrainy*, ed. Nelya M. Kukoval’s’ka (Kyiv/Sudak: Akademperiodyka, 2002), 249–52; Idem, *Istorychna heohrafiya ta naseleण्या Velykoy Bolhariyi (630–660 rr. n.e.): Metodyka doslidzhennya kochovykh suspil’stv seredn’ovichchya* [Candidate’s thesis] (Kharkiv, 1999). Cf.: Denis Sinor, “Horse and Pasture in Inner Asian History,” in *Inner Asia and Its Contacts with Medieval Europe* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1977), 171–83 [first published in 1972]; Rudi Paul Lindner, “Nomadism, Horses and Huns,” *Past & Present* 92 (1981), 3–19.

369 Nikolai N. Kradin, “A Panorama of Social Archaeology in Russia,” in *Comparative Archaeologies: A Sociological View of the Science of the Past*, ed. Ludomir Lozny (New York: Springer, 2011), 250.

370 See: Victor A. Shnirelman, “Postmodernizm i istoricheskiye mify v sovremennoy Rossii,” *Vestnik Omskogo universiteta* (1998), no. 1, 66–71.

371 Fëdor Angeli, *Ocherki istorii gagauzov – potomkov oguzov (seredina VIII–nachalo XXI vv.)* (Chişinău: Tipografia Centrală, 2007).

*the Kyrgyz*,<sup>372</sup> the Kumyk writer Murad Adji's *Sagebrush of the Cuman Steppe*,<sup>373</sup> or many other works by representatives of the Turkic peoples of the former USSR (Lev Gumilyov's works can be included in this group as well). First, their aim is usually to establish links between a particular present-day ethnicity (such as the Gagauzes, Kyrgyz, Kimaks, Uzbeks, or Kazakhs) and a prominent historic nation (the Uzes, Kipchaks, or "Mongol-Tatars") that had its own state and rich culture and occupied vast territories. Second, while such works involve a lot of mythologizing, distortion of historical facts, highly selective treatment of the sources, and elements of messianism, their authors do make a point of building on the existing academic scholarship (and not only for the sake of appearances) when they approach certain facts and phenomena in novel ways.

Despite its dubious scholarly value and the severe and just criticism of it by the academic community,<sup>374</sup> this "alternative historiography" does exert some positive influence on the academic world. While using extra-scholarly methods, it still contributes to the erosion of established paradigms, stimulates interest in the subject as a whole, and thus encourages serious research.



Over the second half of the 20th and early 21st centuries, Soviet and post-Soviet archaeology and medieval and Oriental studies made important contributions to our knowledge of the problem of Byzantine-nomadic relations, even if oftentimes these contributions were not intentional.

The large-scale archaeological excavations of the 1950s to 1980s across the steppes between the Volga and Danube, accompanying the Soviet industrialization, brought to light a wealth of medieval nomadic remains. This material record demanded both general interpretation, offered by S. Pletnyova and G. Fyodorov-Davydov, and analysis within local historical contexts, as demonstrated in the work of G. Chebotarenko, A. Dobrolyubskii, A. Nudelman, or M. Velikanova. The achievements of Soviet historians and archaeologists

372 Rustam A. Abdumanapov, *Kipchaki v etnogeneze kyrgyzov* (Bişkek: Iz-Basma, 2015).

373 Murad Adji, *Polyn' Polovetskogo polya: Iz rodoslovnoy kumykov, karachayevtsev, balkartsev, kazakov, kazakhov, tatar, chuvashy, yakutov, gagauzov, krymskikh tatar, chasti russkikh, ukrainsev i drugikh narodov, vedushchikh svoye nachalo ot tyurkskogo (kipchakskogo) kornya i zabyvshikh yego* (Moscow: Pik-Kontekst, 1994).

374 Aleksandŭr Nikolov, "Ethnos Skythikon': The Uzes in the Balkans (Facts and Interpretations)," in *The Steppe Lands and the World Beyond Them*, 246–7; Nikolaĭ Nikitin, "Fenomen Murada Adzhi," *Literaturnaya Rossiya* (2005) no. 15, 12.

not only served as a methodological beacon for scholars from those countries where finds of nomadic burials, pottery, and other remains were sparse, but also broadened the general picture of the activities of the Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans in Europe.

Soviet medieval studies, whose main priority was the history of Rus', dealt with the problem of Byzantine-nomadic relations almost exclusively through the prism of other issues. This is most evident in the portrayal of the Byzantine vector of the foreign policy of Rus' in the works of Levchenko and Pashuto, as well as in the Soviet approach to the history of medieval Byzantium and Bulgaria (Litavrin) and in the editions of, and commentaries on, Byzantine texts. Overall, Soviet medieval studies' most valuable contributions to the problem considered in this book lie in the area of primary-source criticism.

Among all the important accomplishments of Orientalist scholarship in the USSR and post-Soviet states, it is its advances in the systematic social, environmental, and ethnographic study of medieval nomads and their descendants that are particularly relevant to the subject of Byzantine-nomadic relations.

## International Byzantine and Oriental Studies

The principal problems of truly scientific Byzantine studies (being also, of course, purely political) lie on a completely different plane than the squabbles of imperialist predators for scraps of Byzantine territories.

FĚDOR SCHMIT, “Politika i vizantinovedeniye”<sup>1</sup>



### 1 Congresses of Byzantine Studies

When Edward Gibbon’s *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* appeared in 1776–89, much of Europe was ruled by imperial powers. Throughout the 18th and 19th centuries, interest in the history of Byzantium and the medieval nomads of the North Pontic steppes and the Balkans was closely linked with the progressive loss of territories by the gradually weakening Ottoman Empire. In the 19th century, Greece, Serbia, Romania, and Bulgaria won their independence from the Sublime Porte, the unification of Italy was completed, and Hungary was granted autonomous status within the dual monarchy of Austria-Hungary. The building of nation-states went hand-in-hand with the development of national historiographies. Paris, Berlin, St. Petersburg, London, and Brussels were losing their monopoly on Byzantine and Oriental studies.

It was no accident that the first several international congresses of Byzantine studies were held in the “new” states.<sup>2</sup> As noted by Sandrine Maufroy, these were not just academic, but also diplomatic events, used by the host countries to assert themselves in the international arena.<sup>3</sup> They also served as sites

1 Schmit, “Politika i vizantinovedeniye,” 19.

2 Bucharest, 1924; Belgrade, 1927; Athens, 1930; Sofia, 1934; Rome, 1936; Algiers, 1939 (the last of these did not take place due to the start of the war).

3 Sandrine Maufroy, “Les premiers congrès internationaux des études byzantines: entre nationalisme scientifique et construction internationale d’une discipline,” *Revue germanique internationale* (2010), no. 12, 239–40.

of reconciliation between the recent rivals in World War I.<sup>4</sup> The Byzantine studies congresses of the first half of the 20th century set the mould that still continues to shape these meetings today, including such aspects as interdisciplinarity (with contributions from historians, archaeologists, Orientalists, and representatives of other fields) and close attention to Byzantium's influence on neighboring peoples and vice versa.

World War II made adjustments to the development of Byzantine studies. No congresses were held from 1936 to 1948. Historical scholarship of the countries of Eastern Europe fell under a number of ideological constraints as they were pulled into the communist bloc (see above). Meanwhile, American Byzantine studies, with the center at Dumbarton Oaks, were becoming more influential.<sup>5</sup> After the long break, in 1948 the tradition of international Byzantine studies congresses was revived and an International Association of Byzantine Studies was founded.<sup>6</sup> Since then, the subjects of Byzantium's northern borders and the empire's relations with the peoples of the Steppe have been repeatedly addressed at these scholarly meetings.

At the 11th International Congress of Byzantine Studies in Munich in 1958, Moravcsik presented the second edition of the *Byzantinoturcica*.<sup>7</sup> At the 1961 congress in Ohrid, D. Obolensky spoke on the principles and methods of Byzantine diplomacy;<sup>8</sup> Dionysios A. Zakythinos (1905–93), on the role of church diplomacy in the history of Byzantium; Eugen Stănescu, on Byzantine diplomacy and the crisis on the Lower Danube in the 11th century.<sup>9</sup> For the congress in Oxford in 1966, Gy. Moravcsik prepared a paper on Byzantine

4 Germans, Austrians, and Hungarians were not invited to the First Congress of Byzantine Studies in Bucharest (even though German was one of the official languages of the meeting), but the congress in Athens witnessed a reconciliation between the participants from Germany and France: *Ibid.*, 235–8.

5 In 1942, the governments of France and Belgium in exile helped open the *École libre des hautes études* in New York – a “university-in-exile” for French and Belgian academics. In winter of 1944–45, the Belgian Byzantinologist Henri Grégoire delivered a course of lectures there on “the role of the steppe tribes as mirrored in the Byzantine sources”: Karl H. Menges, “Etymological Notes on Some Păcănăg Names,” 257.

6 Paris, 1948; Brussels, 1948; Palermo, 1951; Thessaloniki, 1953; Istanbul, 1955; Munich, 1958; Ohrid, 1961; Oxford, 1966; Bucharest, 1971; Athens, 1976; Vienna, 1981; Washington, 1986; Moscow, 1991; Copenhagen, 1996; Paris, 2001; London, 2006; Sofia, 2011; Belgrade, 2016; Venice – Padua, 2022 (planned).

7 Angelov, “XI vizantoloshki kongres v Myunkhen,” 126–7.

8 *Ibid.*, 118; Dimitri Obolensky, “The Principles and Methods of Byzantine Diplomacy,” in his *Byzantium and the Slavs. Collected studies* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1971), 43–61 [first published in 1961].

9 Angelov, “Kongresūt na vizantolozite v Okhrid,” 121.

religious missions among the Turkic peoples of the northern Black Sea steppes;<sup>10</sup> a group of Romanian scholars, on the archaeological exploration of the Danubian *limes*.<sup>11</sup>

The Polish Byzantinologist Tadeusz Wasilewski (1933–2005) participated in the congresses in Ohrid and Bucharest. At the first of these, he delivered a paper on certain Byzantine titles,<sup>12</sup> and at the second – on the administration of the *theme* of Paristrion.<sup>13</sup> His other works on the governance of the Balkan region in the Middle Byzantine period are also important.<sup>14</sup> In particular, he posited the coexistence in Byzantium of the regular centralized administration and so-called “tribal lands,” which had autonomy within *themes*.<sup>15</sup>

It would not be an exaggeration to say that the congresses in Ohrid, Oxford, and Bucharest<sup>16</sup> gave a decisive push to the study of Byzantium’s relations with the trans-Danubian Turks.<sup>17</sup> This was to a large extent thanks to the

- 
- 10 Moravcsik, “Byzantinische Mission im Kreise der Türkvölker an der Nordküste des Schwarzen Meers.”
- 11 Condurachi, Barnea and Diaconu, “Nouvelles recherches sur le Limes byzantin du Bas-Danube aux Xe–XIe siècles.”
- 12 Tadeusz Wasilewski, “Le titres du duc, de catepan et de pronote dans l’Empire byzantin du IX jusqu’au XII,” in *Actes du XII Congrès International des Études Byzantines*, vol. 2 (Belgrade: Naučno delo, 1964), 233–9.
- 13 Idem, “Le katepanikon et le duché de Paristrion au XIe siècle,” in *Actes du XIVe Congrès*, 3, 641–5. Wasilewski dates the creation of the province of Paristrion/Paradunavon to 1027 and relates it to the first Pecheneg raid on Byzantium in the 11th century.
- 14 Idem, “Administracja bizantyjska na ziemiach słowiańskich i jej polityka wobec Słowian w XI–XIII w.,” *Kwartalnik Historyczny* (1963) no. 2, 303–23; Idem, “Le thème byzantin de Sirmium-Srem aux XIe–XIIe siècle,” *ZRVF* 8 (1964), 465–82; Idem, “L’administration byzantine dans la vallée du Bas Danube au Xe et XIe siècles selon la sigillographie,” *Dobruđzha* 12 (1995), 190–203.
- 15 Idem, “Administracja bizantyjska na ziemiach słowiańskich,” 321.
- 16 On the political aspect of the congress in Bucharest, see Jonathan Shepard, “Dimitri Dimitrievich Obolensky, 1918–2001,” in *Proceedings of the British Academy*, vol. 124, *Biographical Memoirs of Fellows*, 3, 253.
- 17 In one form or another, the problem of Byzantium’s relations with the Pechenegs or Cumans was raised at almost every congress of Byzantine studies. Consider the topics of some of the papers presented at the congress in Sofia: Gheorghe Manucu-Adamesteanu and Ingrid Poll, “Des considérations sur le limes du nord de la Dobroudja pendant les Xe–XIIIe siècles”; Rossina Kostova, “The Lower Danube in the 12th Century: People, Power, and Communications”; Norman Housley, “Crusading on the Danube; Attila Barany, Hungary and Its Danube Frontier in the Age of the Arpad Kings (c.1000–1301)”; Aleksander Paroń, “Byzantium and Pechenegs in the 10th Century. An Attempt at Rethinking Their Political Relation”; Ioto Valeriev, “The Battles of Dyrrhachium – 1081 and Dristra – 1087 (Comparative Study on the 11th-Century Byzantine Military History),” in *22nd International Congress of Byzantine Studies. Sofia, 22–27 August 2011. Program* (Sofia, 2011).

contributions of Obolensky, Ahrweiler, and Oikonomidès, in addition to the already-mentioned scholars.

Sir Dimitri Obolensky (1918–2001)<sup>18</sup> entered Byzantine studies with his Prize Dissertation on the Bogomils<sup>19</sup> and subsequently became interested in the subject of cultural and political relations between the medieval Slavic states and Byzantium. His overarching vision of the relationship between Constantinople and the group of countries that received Orthodox Christianity from Byzantium was set forth in the books *The Byzantine Commonwealth: Eastern Europe, 500–1453* (1971) and *Six Byzantine Portraits* (1988).<sup>20</sup> Unlike in the British Commonwealth, not all countries included by Obolensky under the umbrella of “the Byzantine Commonwealth”<sup>21</sup> were at some point part of the empire. The main things that united them were the perceived authoritative standing of the Byzantine emperor, often reaffirmed by dynastic marriages, and respect for the principles of Roman-Byzantine law and Orthodoxy with the center in Constantinople. The Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans of the 10th to 13th centuries were *in* but not *of* this world, mainly because of the failure of all attempts to Christianize them and the absence of states among them in the European sense of the word. These peoples’ place, especially the Pechenegs’, was at the receiving end of Constantinople’s diplomatic efforts to protect Byzantine territories. In *The Byzantine Commonwealth*, Obolensky reiterated Vasilievskii’s thesis that the destruction of the First Bulgarian Empire dismantled the barrier between the steppe nomads and Byzantium; notably, he drew on the research of Romanian archaeologists, who had discovered traces of extensive Byzantine fortifications on the empire’s Danubian border.<sup>22</sup>

In his paper delivered at the Ohrid congress, Obolensky characterized the territories north of the Black Sea as Byzantium’s northern borderlands, with

18 About him: Simon Franklin, “Sir Dimitri Obolensky,” in *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 148 (2004), no. 1, 139–44.

19 Building on Vasilievskii’s hypothesis, he raised in this work the question of Bogomilism among the Pechenegs: Dimitri Obolensky, *The Bogomils. A study in Balkan Neo-Manichaeism* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press 1948), 193.

20 Idem, *The Byzantine Commonwealth. Eastern Europe, 500–1453* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971); Idem, *Six Byzantine Portraits* (Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1988); Alexandr P. Kazhdan, “[Review of:] D. Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth. Eastern Europe, 500–1453*. London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971, p. XIV + 445 + 93 plates,” *VizVrem* 35 (1973), 261–2.

21 Obolensky’s conception of the *Byzantine Commonwealth* was, on the whole, accepted by Kazhdan, while Litavrin and Browning questioned its validity: Shepard, “Dimitri Dimitrievich Obolensky, 1918–2001,” 253.

22 Idem, *The Byzantine Commonwealth. Eastern Europe, 500–1453*, 212.



three major pivots: the Caucasus, Crimea, and the Danube.<sup>23</sup> In the 10th century, alliance with the Pechenegs became “the corner-stone of Byzantine diplomacy in the north.”<sup>24</sup> In his article for *The Cambridge Medieval History*, the British scholar wrote that, after the adoption of Judaism by Khazaria, the Alans became the backbone of imperial defense in the North Caucasus, and the Pechenegs fulfilled a similar role in Crimea.<sup>25</sup> Describing Byzantium’s endeavors to protect its northern border, Obolensky drew parallels between the policies of Justinian and those of the emperors of the 10th century; the key to success lay in combining economic incentives, religious propaganda, “political intelligence,” and military pressure.<sup>26</sup>

In his contribution at the congress in Bucharest<sup>27</sup> (the main theme of which was the phenomenon of Byzantine borders), Obolensky called attention to a number of factors that students of Byzantine borderlands had ignored or underappreciated before: the multicultural nature of the Mediterranean region, which might be seen to include the lands around the Black Sea; the two-way influence between Byzantium and its neighboring peoples; climate; the close relationship between the economic and cultural facets of Byzantine influence; the problem of coexistence between Byzantium’s sedentary population and nomads, and specifics of nomadic settlement in different regions of the empire; and the typology of cultural influences.<sup>28</sup> Refining the existing terminology, Obolensky introduced two terms for borders – *limes* and *limen*. He saw *limes* as a clear-cut border, often defined by a geographic barrier, while *limen* stood for a buffer zone most favorable to cultural and any other interchange.<sup>29</sup> Still, even the best-protected and most fortified section of a border could not really prevent such interchange, since it was mutually beneficial. Echoing the methodology and phraseology of Fernand Braudel,<sup>30</sup> Obolensky described the

23 Obolensky, “The Principles and Methods of Byzantine Diplomacy,” 46. Obolensky devoted a special study to Byzantine Crimea, in which he argued that the Pechenegs occupied the entirety of the Crimean steppe: Idem, “The Crimea and the North before 1204,” in his *The Byzantine Inheritance of Eastern Europe* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1982), 129 [first published in 1979].

24 Obolensky, “The Principles and Methods of Byzantine Diplomacy,” 50.

25 Idem, “The Empire and Its Northern Neighbours,” in *Byzantium and the Slavs. Collected studies*, 512.

26 Obolensky, “The Principles and Methods of Byzantine Diplomacy,” 52.

27 Obolensky, “Byzantine Frontier Zones and Cultural Exchanges.”

28 *Ibid.*, 305–11.

29 *Ibid.*, 304.

30 Regarding Braudel’s influence on Obolensky, see: Shepard, “Dimitri Dimitrievich Obolensky, 1918–2001,” 246.

civilizational exchange between Byzantium and the trans-Danubian peoples as a powerful flow that arose out of cultural imbalance.

While Obolensky was mainly concerned with the northern border, Hélène Glykatzi-Ahrweiler presented at the congress in Bucharest a paper on the empire's eastern perimeter.<sup>31</sup> She was already known at the time as the author of studies on the history of the Byzantine administrative system<sup>32</sup> and the brilliant work *Byzance et la mer*,<sup>33</sup> which re-enlivened the discussion between Bulgarian and Romanian scholars on the fate of the Byzantine Lower Danube in the 10th and 11th centuries.<sup>34</sup> In her new piece, she wrote:

By the borders of the Byzantine Empire, we understand the boundary of the nation, the boundary of the civilization, and the boundary of the Byzantine state: these do not necessarily coincide and each of them delimits territories of different extent, but the center, the capital of the Byzantine world, remains always the same.<sup>35</sup>

As the main components of the Byzantine idea of the border, Ahrweiler saw the Roman notion of the homeland (*πατρία*), geographically embodied within the limits of the Roman conquests; the distinction between the civilized world (with the center in Constantinople) and the barbarian; and the idea of one Roman nation held together by Christianity.<sup>36</sup> Byzantium was the “Christian world,” Constantinople – the “new Rome” and “new Jerusalem” in one, and the *Rhomaioi* – the new “chosen people.”<sup>37</sup> Despite all of the empire's persistent efforts, its political, economic, and cultural borders never coincided.

By “political borders,” Ahrweiler understood “a world in solidarity with Constantinople and its government,” in the periphery of which there was a host of petty state-like entities, sometimes autonomous, which served as a buffer between Byzantium and its opponents. The researcher assigned an extremely important role to this buffer, especially in cultural and economic exchange.<sup>38</sup>

31 Hélène Ahrweiler, “La frontière et les frontières de Byzance en Orient,” in *Actes du XIVe Congrès*, 1, 209–30.

32 Eadem, “Recherches sur l'administration de l'empire byzantin aux IXe–XIe siècles,” *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 84 (1960), 1–111.

33 Eadem, *Byzance et la mer. La marine de guerre, la politique et les institutions maritimes de Byzance aux VIIe–XVe siècles* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1966).

34 See, for instance, Tüpkova-Zaimova, “L'administration byzantine au Bas-Danube,” 93; Eadem, *Dolni Dunav – granichna zona*, 39–40.

35 Ahrweiler, “La frontière et les frontières de Byzance en Orient,” 209.

36 *Ibid.*, 210.

37 *Ibid.*

38 *Ibid.*, 212.

Using the empire's eastern possessions as a case study, Ahrweiler showed that the territory of Byzantium often included areas beyond the state's control and that the central government could be described as a series of "islands," embracing only the large fortified cities and their hinterlands.<sup>39</sup> We find similar tribal enclaves outside imperial control in the Balkans in the 11th and 12th centuries. In characterizing the eastern border of the empire, Ahrweiler sketched out a phenomenon of "peuples limitrophes et frontaliers," offering the Armenians as an example.<sup>40</sup>

At the conference "From Rome to the Third Rome" in 1982, Ahrweiler delivered a paper on "Citizens and Aliens in the Eastern Roman Empire,"<sup>41</sup> which would become the inspiration for a number of studies on the image of the foreigner in Byzantium.<sup>42</sup> Both Obolensky and Ahrweiler agreed that no genuine integration of aliens into Byzantine society was possible without Christianization. In the case of the Bulgarians, though they had political interests of their own, they still fell under the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople, who had to reckon with them and protect them as his flock, sometimes even against his own government. Non-Christian nomads were seen by the Byzantines as peoples without history, without culture, and without statehood, enemies not only of Byzantium, but also of the entire "genos of the Christians."<sup>43</sup>

At the congresses of 1961 and 1971, Nikos Oikonomidès (1934–2000)<sup>44</sup> delivered papers based on the *tactikon* he had discovered in the late 1950s in the

39 Ibid., 220–1.

40 Ibid., 227.

41 Eadem, "Citoyens et étrangers dans l'Empire romain d'Orient," in *La nozione di "Romano" tra cittadinanza e universalità. Atti del II Seminario internazionale di studi storici "Da Roma alla terza Roma"*, 21–23 aprile 1982 (Naples: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 1984), 343–50.

42 Athina Kolia-Dermizaki, "Die Kreuzfahrer und die Kreuzzüge im Sprachengebrauch der Byzantiner," *JÖB* 41 (1991), 167; Malamut, "L'image byzantine des Petchénègues"; Ahrweiler, "Byzantine Concepts of the Foreigner: The Case of the Nomads"; Angeliki E. Laiou, "Institutional Mechanisms of Integration," in *Studies on the Internal Diaspora of the Byzantine Empire*, 161–81; Anthony Kaldellis, *Ethnography after Antiquity: Foreign Lands and People in Byzantine Literature* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013). See also: Julius Jüthner, *Hellenen und Barbaren* (Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1923); Kilian Lechner, *Hellenen und Barbaren im Weltbild der Byzantiner. Die alten Bezeichnungen als Ausdruck eines neuen Kulturbewusstseins* [Dissertation] (Munich, 1954); Idem, "Byzanz und die Barbaren," *Saeculum* 6 (1955), 292–306.

43 See: Gautier, "Le Typikon du sébaste Grégoire Pakourianos," 44.

44 Nikos Oikonomidès studied under the well-known Byzantinologists Dionysios A. Zakythinos, Paul Lemerle, and Vitalien Laurent. His academic career began at the age of 18, when he submitted his first article on the cult of St. Phokas of Sinope to the journal *Αρχαίον Πόντου*. Under the direction of Paul Lemerle, he prepared a dissertation based on

library of El Escorial, which supplemented the already known treatises of this kind. While at the congress in Ohrid he merely introduced the new document, in 1971 he used this source as the basis for a study of the administrative organization of Byzantium's eastern border.<sup>45</sup> A year later, he published a book on *Les listes de préséance byzantines des IXe et Xe siècles*,<sup>46</sup> which included his commented French translations of several 9th- and 10th-century *taktika*: the *Taktikon Benešević*, *Taktikon Uspensky* and *Klētorologion of Philotheos*, and the *Taktikon Escorial* itself, which later became known as the *Taktikon Oikonomides*.

The *Taktikon Escorial* lists seven governors of large regions (referred to as *doux* and *katepano*), eleven *strategoï* of central *themes*, and over seventy *strategoï* of border districts. Among these areas, the text mentions a mysterious Μεσοποταμία τῆς Δύσεως (Mesopotamia of the West).<sup>47</sup> Oikonomidès surmised that this was a late-10th-century administrative district spanning both banks of the Lower Danube.<sup>48</sup> However, according to him, around 1000 AD the occupation of the river's left bank by the Pechenegs made the existence of the Mesopotamia of the West impossible and led to the formation of the *theme* of Paradunavon, which covered only the right bank of the Danube.<sup>49</sup> In the name "Mesopotamia," Oikonomidès (following Moravcsik) saw an echo of the region of Ἀτελκοῦζου (land between rivers), mentioned in the *DAI* and located somewhere between the Dnieper and Danube. The Byzantine Μεσοποταμία τῆς Δύσεως did not extend that far to the east and was confined to the territories adjacent to the left bank of the Danube.<sup>50</sup> To support his thesis, Oikonomidès drew on research by Romanian archaeologists, including in Păcuiul lui Soare, and on coin and seal finds.<sup>51</sup> Such integrated approach to the use of sources, incorporating written, numismatic, archaeological, and sigillographic materials, was at the time quite innovative for Byzantine studies; the discipline was accustomed to trust "the written word" more than anything else. In the same article, Oikonomidès opposed the identification of Κουλίνοϋς,

---

the newly-discovered *Taktikon* at the Sorbonne. After the coup of the "black colonels," he had to emigrate to Canada, where from 1967 to 1989 he worked at the University of Montreal. See: John Nesbitt and Eric McGeer, "Nicolas Oikonomides (1934–2000)," *DOP* 54 (2000), IX–XIII.

45 Nikos Oikonomidès, "L'organisation de la frontière orientale de Byzance aux Xe–XIe ss. et le *Taktikon* de l'Escorial," in *Actes du XIVe Congrès*, 2, 73–90.

46 Idem, *Les listes de préséance byzantines des IXe et Xe siècles* (Paris: Centre National de la recherche scientifique, 1972).

47 Idem, "Recherches sur l'histoire du Bas-Danube aux X–XI siècles," 57.

48 Ibid., 74.

49 Ibid., 75.

50 Ibid., 68–73.

51 Ibid., 64–8.

the Pecheneg who saved Kekaumenos,<sup>52</sup> with Γουλίνοϛ,<sup>53</sup> the son of Kegen and brother of Βαλτζάρ.<sup>54</sup> Oikonomidès continued to return to the subject of Byzantium's northern border in later years.<sup>55</sup>

Oikonomidès believed that progress in Byzantine studies could be achieved through the publication of previously unpublished sources, such as seals.<sup>56</sup> Most finds of Byzantine seals are scattered across private collections, making their proper description, classification, and publication difficult. For both seals and coins, such work is done primarily on the basis of the holdings of large museums. In 1972, Oikonomidès was invited to Dumbarton Oaks to catalog the Dumbarton Oaks and Fogg Museum of Art collection, numbering approximately 17,000 Byzantine seals. Together with his assistant John Nesbitt, by 1979 Oikonomidès completed the project.<sup>57</sup> In 1986, he put out a catalog of dated Byzantine seals,<sup>58</sup> and in 1987 founded a serial publication *Studies in Byzantine Sigillography*, which began bringing out both new research in this field and a bibliography going back to 1931.<sup>59</sup>

52 *Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsis historiarum*, 469.

53 *Ibid.*, 469; Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, 2, 166.

54 Oikonomidès, "Recherches sur l'histoire du Bas-Danube aux X–XI siècles," 77. Shepard unequivocally identifies the man who saved Kekaumenos with the son of Kegen: Shepard, "Mingling with Northern Barbarians: Advantages and Perils," 222. There is a possibility that one seal from the collection of Dimitri Theodoridis belonged to this individual: Jean-Claude Cheynet and Dimitri Theodoridis, *Sceaux byzantins de la collection D. Theodoridis: les sceaux patronymiques* (Paris: ACHByz, 2010), 95–6 (number 82); Fiedler, "Zur Suche nach dem archäologischen Niederschlag von Petschenegen," 252.

55 Nikos Oikonomidès, "Vardariotes – W.l.nd.r – v.n.nd.r: Hongrois installés dans la vallée du Vardar en 934," *sof* 32 (1973), 1–8; *Idem*, "L'évolution de l'organisation administrative de l'empire Byzantin au XIe siècle (1025–1118)," *Travaux et Mémoires* (1976), no. 6, 126–52; *Idem*, "Presthlavitz, the Little Preslav," *sof* 42 (1983), 1–9; *Idem*, "À propos de la première occupation byzantine de la Bulgarie (971 – ca. 986)," in *EYΨΥΧΙΑ. Mélanges offerts à Hélène Ahrweiler*, vol. 2, ed. Angeliki E. Laiou (Paris: Éditions de la Sorbonne, 1998), 581–9.

56 Jacques Lefort, "In memoriam: Nicolas Oikonomidès," *RÉB* 59 (2001), 251.

57 *Catalogue of Byzantine Seals at Dumbarton Oaks and in the Fogg Museum of Art*, 6 vols, eds. John W. Nesbitt, Nikos Oikonomidès et al. (Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1991–2009). *The Catalogue of Byzantine Seals* is currently accessible online: *Online Catalogue of Byzantine Seals*. Available at <https://www.doaks.org/resources/seals>. Accessed on 1 February 2020. Other important catalogs of Byzantine seals have been compiled by Vitalien Laurent, George Zakos, Alexander Veglery, Werner Seibt, Jean-Claude Cheynet, Cécile Morrisson, and other Byzantinologists.

58 Nikos Oikonomidès, *A Collection of Dated Byzantine Seals* (Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1986); Ivan Bozhilov, "Izdaniya na vizantiiski pechati," *IstPreg* (1990), no. 10, 69–71.

59 Nesbitt and McGeer, "Nicolas Oikonomides (1934–2000)," IX–XI. The *SBS* served as a continuation of the *Bulletin de sigillographie byzantine*, published until 1931 by Vitalien

Oikonomidès often used seals as evidence to back his arguments. For instance, based on the fact that in Preslav many more seal finds dating from the last third of the 10th century were attributable to Byzantine military commanders than to civil administrators (judges, protonotaries, or *anagrapheis*), Oikonomidès concluded that Preslav appeared “to have been the headquarters of an occupying army that did not manage – perhaps did not even try – to win over and control the local population.”<sup>60</sup>

After the congresses of 1961 and 1971, the initiative in the study of Byzantium’s northern border was to some extent seized by Bulgarian and Romanian scholars. At the Athens congress (1976), the Romanian historian Milan Şesan gave a paper on the Byzantine presence on the Lower Danube in the 10th to 13th centuries; Tŭpkova-Zaimova – on the population of the Lower Danube lands and the Byzantine authorities; Diaconu – on 10th- to 12th-century Byzantine material culture in the region.<sup>61</sup> In the study of the history of the Danubian provinces, which, in the words of Paul Stephenson, had previously been “a footnote to the history of the empire,”<sup>62</sup> accents began to shift. In the first half of the 20th century, Byzantinologists were mostly concerned with two major problems in the 10th- to 12th-century history of the region: the time of the establishment and the configuration of Byzantine rule on the Lower Danube, and the ethnic composition of the local population. The introduction of new sources, archaeological discoveries of the 1950s–1970s, and new trends in historical scholarship (as preoccupation with nation states began to give way to the study of historical phenomena such as frontiers<sup>63</sup>) broadened the range of issues discussed.

---

Laurent. By 2019, 13 issues of the *SBS* had come out. In addition to articles, it carries information on “Seals Published” and auction catalogs.

- 60 Oikonomidès, “À propos de la première occupation byzantine de la Bulgarie (971 – ca. 986),” 587.
- 61 Milan Şesan, “Über die byzantinische Anwesenheit an der Unter-Donau im 10. bis 13. Jahrhundert,” in *Actes du XVe Congrès International des Études Byzantines. Athènes. Septembre 1976*, 4, 275–82; “La population du Bas-Danube et le pouvoir byzantin (XI et XII siècles),” in *Actes du XVe Congrès International des Études Byzantines. Athènes. Septembre 1976*, 4, 331–9; Diaconu, “A propos de la culture matérielle byzantine du Bas Danube aux Xe–XIIIe siècle.”
- 62 Stephenson, *Byzantium’s Balkan Frontier*, 13.
- 63 See, for instance, Theodore Papadopoullos, “The Byzantine Model in Frontier History. A Comparative Approach,” in *Actes du XIVe Congrès*, 2, 415–9; Robert Browning, *Byzantium and Bulgaria. A Comparative Study across the Early Medieval Frontier* (London: Temple Smith, 1975); Jonathan Shepard, “The Russian Steppe-Frontier and the Black Sea Zone,” in *Archeion Póntou* 35 (1979), 218–37; Walter Kaegi, “The Frontier: Barrier or Bridge,” in *Major Papers of the 17th International Byzantine Congress: Washington, D.C., August 3–8, 1986* (New Rochelle, N.Y.: A.D. Caratzas, 1986), 279–305; Dimitri Obolensky, “The Balkans in the Ninth Century: Barrier or Bridge?” *BF* 13 (1988), 47–66; Daniel Power, “Frontiers:

The general attitude towards the 11th-century Byzantium was also changing.<sup>64</sup> The Russian imperial historiographical tradition (Vasilievskii, Uspenskii, Vasiliev), continued by Georg Ostrogorsky, had measured the greatness of a state by the extent of its territory and stability of its government and therefore branded this period in the history of Byzantium as one of decline. While Ostrogorsky had seen the reign of Basil II as “the apogee of Byzantine power”<sup>65</sup> and the years 1025–81 as the beginning of its decay,<sup>66</sup> now, thanks to the works of P. Lemerle,<sup>67</sup> A. Kazhdan,<sup>68</sup> J.-C. Cheynet,<sup>69</sup> M. Angold,<sup>70</sup> J. Shepard,<sup>71</sup> and other scholars, the 11th century came to be perceived differently.<sup>72</sup>

- 
- Terms, Concepts, and the Historians of Medieval and Early Modern Europe,” in *Frontiers in Question. Eurasian Borderlands, 700–1700*, eds. Daniel Power and Naomi Standen (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999), 1–12.
- 64 Michael Angold, “Belle Époque or Crisis? (1025–1118),” in *CHBE*, 583–6; Peter Schreiner, “Schein und Sein. Überlegungen zu den Ursachen des Untergangs des byzantinischen Reiches,” in *Historische Zeitschrift* 266 (1998), 625–47; *The Empire in Crisis (?): Byzantium in the 11th Century (1025–1081)*, eds. Vassiliki N. Vlysidou et al. (Athens: Ethnikó Idryma Erevnón, Institutoú Vyzantinón Erevnón, 2003); *Byzantium in the Eleventh Century. Being in Between*, eds. Marc D. Lauxtermann and Mark Whittow (London/New York: Routledge, 2017).
- 65 George Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State*, transl. Joan M. Hussey (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1968), 298–315.
- 66 *Ibid.*, 316–50.
- 67 Paul Lemerle, *Cinq études sur le XIe siècle byzantin* (Paris: Éditions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1977); Alexandr P. Kazhdan, “Remarques sur le XIe siècle byzantin. A propos d’un livre récent de Paul Lemerle,” *Byzantion* 49 (1979), 491–503.
- 68 Kazhdan, *Sotsial’nyy sostav gosподstvyuyushchego klassa Vizantii XI–XII vv.*; Alexandr P. Kazhdan and Giles Constable, *People and Power in Byzantium* (Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1982).
- 69 Jean-Claude Cheynet, *Pouvoir et contestations à Byzance (963–1210)* (Paris: Éditions de la Sorbonne, 1990); *Idem*, “La politique militaire de Basile II à Alexis Comnène,” *ZRVI* 29–30 (1991), 61–74; *Idem*, “Basil II and Asia Minor,” in *Byzantium in the Year 1000*, 71–108.
- 70 Michael Angold, *The Byzantine Empire, 1025–1204: A Political History* (London: Longman, 1984); *Idem*, “The Byzantine State on the Eve of the Battle of Manzikert,” *BF* 16 (1991), 9–34; *Idem*, *Church and Society in Byzantium under Comneni, 1081–1261* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1995).
- 71 Jonathan Shepard, “Byzantine Diplomacy, AD 800–1204: Means and Ends,” in *Byzantine Diplomacy. Papers from the 24th Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies (Cambridge, March 1990)*, eds. Jonathan Shepard and Simon Franklin (Aldershot: Variorum Reprints, 1992), 41–71; Jonathan Shepard, “Equilibrium to Expansion (886–1025),” in *CHBE*, 493–536; *Idem*, “Western Approaches (900–1025),” in *CHBE*, 537–59.
- 72 See: John Rosser, “[Review of:] *Byzantine Studies: Essays on the Slavic World and the Eleventh Century.* / Ed. by Speros Vryonis Jr. New Rochelle, N.Y.: Aristide D. Caratzas, 1992. 188 p.,” *Speculum* 68 (1993), no. 3, 905–6.

## 2 Publication of Major Sources

At the 1966 Byzantine studies congress in Oxford, the decision was made to launch a new series of publications of Byzantine sources – the *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae* (CFHB).<sup>73</sup> The principles of this series, formulated in 1968, presupposed that each publication of a Greek source would be accompanied by a thorough critical study, translation into a modern language, index, and bibliography.

The inaugural volume of the series was the *DAI* edited by Gyula Moravcsik and Romilly Jenkins (1907–69).<sup>74</sup> Moravcsik had begun work on the unification of the Greek text as early as 1926. Jenkins joined the project in 1947, their edition first saw light in Budapest in 1949, and a commentary came out in 1962 (see Chapter 2). Byzantinologists are still debating the work's authorship, purpose, composition, and dating.<sup>75</sup> Romilly Jenkins and Leendert Gerrit Westerink (1913–90) prepared for publication another important source for the history of the steppe peoples of the North Pontic region: the letters of Nicholas I, patriarch of Constantinople.<sup>76</sup>

73 A fairly detailed overview of the sources for the history of Byzantium can be found in the monograph by Karagiannopoulos and Weiss: Ioannis Karagiannopoulos and Günter Weiss, *Quellenkunde zur Geschichte von Byzanz (324–1453)* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1982). Wolfgang Schule published a bibliography of translations of Byzantine texts up to 1982: Wolfgang Schule, *Bibliographie der Übersetzungen griechisch-byzantinischer Quellen* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1982). See also: Leonora A. Neville, *Guide to Byzantine Historical Writing* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2018).

74 Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Administrando Imperio* (CFHB, 1).

75 See, for instance, Gavro Manojlović, *Studije o spisu 'De administrando imperio' cara Konstantina VII Porfirogenita* (Zagreb: Tisak Dioničke tiskare, 1911); Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Administrando Imperio*, 2, 12; Irène Sorlin, "Le témoignage de Constantin VII Porphyrogénète sur l'état ethnique et politique de la Russie au début du Xe siècle," *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique* 6 (1965), no. 2, 147–88; Telemachos C. Lounghis, *Konstantínou VII' Porfyrogénitou De Administrando Imperio (Pros ton idion yíon Romanón): mia méthodos anágnosis*; James Howard-Johnston, "The De Administrando Imperio: A Re-Examination of the Text and a Re-Evaluation of Its Evidence about the Rus," in *Les Centres proto-urbains russes entre Scandinavie, Byzance et Orient: Actes du Colloque Int. tenu au Collège de France en octobre 1997*, eds. Michel Kazanski et al. (Réalités byzantines, 7) (Paris: P. Lethielleux, 2000), 301–36; Ihor Ševčenko, "Re-reading Constantine Porphyrogenitus," in *Byzantine Diplomacy. Papers from the 24th Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies* (Cambridge, March 1990), 167–95.

76 *Nicolai I Constantinopolitani patriarchae Epistolae*, eds. Romilly Jenkins and Leendert G. Westerink (Dumbarton Oaks Texts, 2) (Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1973). Jenkins authored a number of articles on the history of Byzantium in the 7th to 11th centuries and essays in source criticism: Romilly Jenkins, *Byzantium: The Imperial Centuries, AD 610–1071* (London: Random House, 1966).



A French translation of the first book of the *De Ceremoniis* was published by the Swiss Byzantinologist Albert Vogt (1874–1942) in 1935–39.<sup>77</sup> John Haldon started off his scholarly career with a new critical edition of this work.<sup>78</sup> A full translation of it recently appeared in the series *Byzantina Australiensia*.<sup>79</sup> In Vatican in 1952, the Italian philologist Agostino Pertusi (1918–79) put out an edition of the *De Thematibus*.<sup>80</sup> Klaus Belke and Peter Soustal translated the *DAI* into German.<sup>81</sup> In 1956, a German translation of the *Strategikon* of Kekaumenos was published by Hans-Georg Beck (1910–99),<sup>82</sup> and in 1960, Paul Lemerle (1903–89) wrote an “Introduction to the Critical Edition,” where he expressed his views on the source and its author.<sup>83</sup> Georgina Buckler translated the *Consilia et Narrationes* (an alternative name for the *Strategikon* of Kekaumenos) into English, but the translation was only published in 2013 by her granddaughter, Charlotte Roueché.<sup>84</sup>

Étienne Sargologos edited the *Vitae of Cyril Phileotes* (1964).<sup>85</sup> The value of this source for Pecheneg history lies in the fact that it supplements the testimony of Anna Komnene and Zonaras regarding the fate of those Pechenegs

77 Constantin VII Porphyrogénète, *Le livre des cérémonies*, 2 vols, ed. and transl. Albert Vogt (Paris: La société d'édition Les Belles Lettres, 1935–1939).

78 Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *Three Treatises on Imperial Military Expeditions*, ed. and trans. John F. Haldon (*CFHB*, 28) (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1990); Idem, “Theory and Practice in Tenth-century Military Administration. Chapters II, 44 and 45 of the Book of Ceremonies,” *Travaux et Mémoires* (2000), no. 13, 201–352.

79 Constantine Porphyrogenetos, *The Book of Ceremonies*.

80 *Costantino Porfirogenito De Thematibus*, ed. Agostino Pertusi (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1952); George Ostrogorsky, “Sur la date de la composition du livre des thèmes et sur l'époque de la constitution des premiers thèmes d'Asie Mineure. À propos de la nouvelle édition du ‘De thematibus’ de A. Pertusi,” *Byzantion* 23 (1953), 31–66. Pertusi was one of the authors of the conception behind the *CFHB* series. He published articles on the Byzantine *theme* system: Agostino Pertusi, “Nuova ipotesi sull'origine dei ‘temi’ bizantini,” *Aevum* 28 (1954), 126–50.

81 *Die Byzantiner und ihre Nachbarn. Die De administrando imperio genannte Lehrschrift des Kaisers Konstantinos Porphyrogenetos für seinen Sohn Romanos*, transl., ed. and comment. Klaus Belke and Peter Soustal (Byzantinische Geschichtsschreiber, 19) (Vienna: Verlag Fassbaender, 1995); Günter Prinzing, “[Review of:] *Die Byzantiner und ihre Nachbarn...*,” *BZ* 91 (1998), 104–6.

82 *Vademecum des byzantinischen Aristokraten: das sogenannte Strategikon des Kekaumenos*, ed. Hans-Georg Beck (Byzantinische Geschichtsschreiber, 5) (Graz: Verlag Styria, 1956).

83 Paul Lemerle, *Prolégomènes à une édition critique et commentée des “Conseils et récits” de Kékauménos* (Brussels: J. Duculot, 1960).

84 *Consilia et narrationes*, Greek text, English transl. and comment. Charlotte Roueché (London: Sharing Ancient Wisdoms, 2013).

85 *La vie de saint Cyrille le Philéote, moine byzantin*; Patricia Karlin-Hayter, “L'édition de la Vie de saint Cyrille le Philéote par E. Sargologos,” *Byzantion* 34 (1964), 608–10.

who survived the battle of 29 April, 1091. Specifically, it contains the only extant reference to Pecheneg baptism in the late 11th century.<sup>86</sup>

Students of the history of Byzantium's relations with steppe nomads in the 11th century long felt the need for a critical edition of the *Synopsis historiarum* of Ioannes Skylitzes.<sup>87</sup> Such an edition was finally prepared by Hans Thurn (1934–93).<sup>88</sup> The German Byzantinologist also set out to translate the source into his native language, but only the first part of the project was published, covering the period until the mid-10th century.<sup>89</sup> Translations into French and English were only made in 2000 by Bernard Flusin<sup>90</sup> and John Wortley.<sup>91</sup> Eudoxos Tsolakis edited the *Ioannes Skylitzes Continuatus*, insisting that this continuation of the *Synopsis historiarum* to the year 1079 (*Synopsis historiarum* ends in 1057) was also written by Ioannes Skylitzes.<sup>92</sup>

Pietro Luigi Leone published the letters and the *History* of the Byzantine poet and intellectual Ioannes Tzetzes.<sup>93</sup> In 1975, the *CFHB* series featured the *Historia* of Niketas Choniates<sup>94</sup> and “*Ἔλλη Ἱστορίας*” of Nikephoros Bryennios.<sup>95</sup> Paul Gautier edited the oeuvre of Theophylact of Ohrid (speeches, treatises, poems, and letters),<sup>96</sup> the *Testament (Diataxis)* of Michael Attaleiates, *Typikon*

- 
- 86 Gyuzelev, “Svedeniya za bŭlgarski gradove i oblasti v Zhitieto na Kiril Fileot (XI v.),” 65.
- 87 On Ioannes Skylitzes, see: Jean-Claude Cheynet, “Introduction: John Scylitzes, the Autor and His Family,” in John Skylitzes, *A Synopsis of Byzantine History, 811–1057*, transl. John Wortley (Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press, 2010), IX–XI.
- 88 *Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsis historiarum*, ed. Hans Thurn (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1973); Georgios Fatouros, “Textkritische Beobachtungen zu Ioannes Skylitzes,” *JÖB* 24 (1975), 91–4.
- 89 *Byzanz – wieder ein Weltreich. Das Zeitalter der makedonischen Dynastie, nach dem Geschichtswerk des Johannes Skylitzes übersetzt, eingeleitet und erklärt von Hans Thurn. Part 1. Ende des Bilderstreites und makedonische Renaissance (Anfang 9. bis Mitte 10. Jahrhundert)* (Graz: Verlag Styria, 1983).
- 90 Jean Skylitzès, *Empereurs de Constantinople*, transl. Bernard Flusin, annot. Jean-Claude Cheynet (Paris: Lethielleux, 2003).
- 91 John Skylitzes, *A Synopsis of Byzantine History, 811–1057*.
- 92 Eudoxos Tsolakis, *I synécheia tis chronografias tou Ioánnou Skylítsi* (Thessaloniki: Etaireia Makedonikón Spoudón, 1968), 76–99.
- 93 *Ioannis Tzetzae Historiae*, Pietro A.M. Leone (Naples: Libreria scientifica editrice, 1968); *Ioannis Tzetzae Epistulae*, ed. Pietro A.M. Leone (Leipzig: BSB B.G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, 1972).
- 94 *Nicetae Choniatae Historia*, 2 vols, ed. Jan Louis van Dieten (*CFHB* 11, 1–2) (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1975).
- 95 *Nicephori Bryennii historiarum libri quattuor*, ed. Paul Gautier (*CFHB*, 9) (Brussels: Byzantion, 1975).
- 96 *Theophylacti Achridensis Orationes, Tractatus, Carmina*, vol. 1, ed. Paul Gautier (*CFHB* 16/1) (Thessaloniki: Association de recherches byzantines, 1980); *Theophylacti Achridensis*

of Gregorios Pakourianos, *Historiarum* of Nikephoros Bryennios, and works of Michael Psellos and other Byzantine authors.<sup>97</sup> Albert Failler and Vitalien Laurent published the historical works of Georgios Pachymeres,<sup>98</sup> and Wolfram Hörandner – the speeches of Theodoros Prodromos.<sup>99</sup> Charles M. Brand translated into English the *Epitome rerum* of Ioannes Kinnamos.<sup>100</sup> A new edition of the speeches of Ioannes Mauropous appeared in Amsterdam in 1979.<sup>101</sup>

In 1990, Odysseus Lapsides came out with an edition of the *Historia chronica* of Ephraim,<sup>102</sup> and Willem Aerts published an edition of the *Historia Syntomos* of Michael Psellos.<sup>103</sup> Staffan Wahlgren put out an updated edition of the *Chronicle* of Symeon Logothetes.<sup>104</sup> Michael Featherstone, Juan Signes Codoñer, and Ihor Ševčenko began the publication of *Theophanes*

---

*Epistulae*, vol. 2, ed. Paul Gautier (CFHB 16/2) (Thessaloniki: Association de recherches byzantines, 1986).

- 97 Paul Gautier, "Le Discours de Théophylacte de Bulgarie à l'autocrator Alexis I-er Comnène (6 janvier 1088)," *RÉB* 20 (1962), 93–130; Nicéphore Bryennios, *Histoire*, ed. Paul Gautier (Brussels: Byzantion, 1975); Idem, "La Diataxis de Michel Attaliatè," *RÉB* 39 (1981), 5–143; Idem, "Le typikon du sébaste Grégoire Pakourianos." English translation (by Robert Jordan): "Pakourianos: Typikon of Gregory Pakourianos for the Monastery of the Mother of God Petritzonitissa in Bačkovo," in *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents: A Complete Translation of the Surviving Founders' Typika and Testaments*, eds. John Thomas and Angela C. Hero (Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2000), 507–63.
- 98 *Georgii Pachymeris Relationes historicae*, 3 vols, eds. Albert Failler and Vitalien Laurent (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1984–1999).
- 99 Theodoros Prodromos, *Historische Gedichte*, ed. Wolfram Hörandner (Wiener Byzantinistische Studien, 11) (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1974). See also: Athanasios Kambylis, *Prodromea: textkritische Beiträge zu den historischen Gedichten des Theodoros Prodromos* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1984).
- 100 John Kinnamos, *Deeds of John and Manuel Comnenus*, transl. Charles M. Brand (New York: Columbia University Press, 1976).
- 101 [First published in 1882, ed. by Paul de Lagarde:] *Iohannis Euchaitorum Metropolitanæ Quæ in Codice Vaticano Graeco 676 supersunt* (Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1979).
- 102 *Ephraem Aenii Historia chronica*, ed. Odysseus Lapsides (Athens: Akadimía Athinón, 1990). This source has much to say about nomads, but its information comes from the works of Zonaras, Niketas Choniates, and Georgios Akropolites: Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, 1, 256.
- 103 *Michaelis Pselli Historia Syntomos*, ed. and transl. Willem Aerts (CFHB, 30) (Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 1990).
- 104 *Symeonis Magistri et Logothetae Chronicon*, ed. Staffan Wahlgren (CFHB, 44/1) (Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 2006).

*Continuatus*.<sup>105</sup> Raimondo Tocci's edition of the *Chronicle* of Theodoros Skoutariotes appeared in 2015.<sup>106</sup>

For a long time, the most cited edition of the *Alexiad* was that of Bernard Leib (1937–45). Given the value of this source for the history of many European peoples, the second half of the 20th century saw the publication of translations of the *Alexiad* into Russian (Lyubarskiĭ, 1965), English (Sewter, 1969), Polish (Jurewicz, 1969–72), Romanian (Marinescu, 1977), Modern Greek (Sideri, 1990–91), and German (Reinsch, 1996). In 2001, Diether Reinsch and Athanasios Kambylis completed a corrected scholarly edition of the work.<sup>107</sup> A prosopographic study of the *Alexiad* was done by Basile Skoulatos.<sup>108</sup> Anthony Kaldellis and Dimitris Krallis published a translation of the *History* of Michael Attaleiates.<sup>109</sup>

The *CFHB* series is currently planning critical editions of a number of other important sources for the history of Byzantium and its nomadic neighbors in the 10th to 12th centuries. These editions include the works of Ioannes Zonaras (Pietro Leone), Leo the Deacon (Nikolaos Panagiotakis and Athanasios Markopoulos), and Michael Glykas (Martin Hinterberger).<sup>110</sup> Some of these have already been translated into modern languages, fully or in part.<sup>111</sup> Georgios Hamartolos, on the other hand, still awaits his researchers, translators, and editors.<sup>112</sup>

105 *CFHB* 53 and 42. Only the so-called Textes I and II have been published. Text III, which covers the years 886–961, still awaits a modern edition.

106 *Theodori Scutariotae Chronica: editio princeps*, ed. Raimondo Tocci (*CFHB*, 46) (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015).

107 *Annae Comnenae Alexias*, vol. 1, *Prolegomena et textus*; vol. 2, *Indices*, eds. Dieter Reinsch and Athanasios Kambylis (*CFHB* 40/1–2) (Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 2001).

108 Basile Skoulatos, *Les personnages byzantins de l'Alexiade. Analyse prosopographique et synthèse* (Louvain-la-Neuve: Collège Érasme, 1980).

109 Michael Attaleiates, *The History*, eds. Anthony Kaldellis and Dimitris Krallis (Cambridge, Mass./London: Harvard University Press, 2012). A Spanish edition was prepared by Inmaculada Pérez Martín: *Miguel Atalates, Historia*, ed. Inmaculada Pérez Martín (Nueva Roma, 15) (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2002).

110 Andreas Rhoby, "Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae. Stand der Publikationen (Februar 2019)," *JÖB* 68 (2018), 291–4.

111 Nikephoros Phokas "Der bleiche Tod der Sarazenen' und Johannes Tzimiskes – Die Zeit von 959 bis 976 in der Darstellung des Leon Diakonos, ed. Franz Loretto (Graz: Verlag Styria, 1961); *The History of Leo the Deacon. Byzantine Military Expansion in the Tenth Century*, eds. Alice-Mary Talbot and Denis F. Sullivan (Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2005); *Militärs und Höflinge im Ringen um das Kaisertum: Byzantinische Geschichte von 969 bis 1118. Nach der Chronik dez Joannes Zonaras*, ed. Erich Trapp (Graz: Verlag Styria, 1986).

112 Neville, *Guide to Byzantine Historical Writing*, 87–92.

Despite skepticism in some quarters, coin and seal finds have become an important source for the history of Byzantium's Balkan possessions in the 10th and 11th centuries. Coin finds carry information about periods of economic decline or prosperity, trade routes, economic centers, and social or military disasters.<sup>113</sup> Coin hoards may be evidence of anxiety and foreign invasion, or of military preparations and the presence of imperial forces.<sup>114</sup>

- 113 For a long time, the standard reference work for scholars working with Byzantine coin finds was Warwick William Wroth's (1858–1911) *Catalogue of the Imperial Byzantine Coins in the British Museum*, 2 vols (London: Longman, 1908). In 1928–33, Hugh A. Goodacre put out his *Handbook of the Coinage of the Byzantine Empire* (London: Spink, 1960). In 1954, the American scholar Margaret E. Thompson (1911–92) published a study based on excavations on the Athenian agora: Margaret E. Thompson, *The Athenian Agora. Results of excavations conducted by The American School of Classical Studies at Athens*, vol. 2, *Coins. From the Roman Through the Venetian* (Princeton: The school, 1954). This was the work used by Diaconu in his analysis of the coin finds which became part of the evidence base for his book *The Pechenegs on the Lower Danube*. The French scholar Cécile Morrisson, compiling a catalog of the Byzantine coins in the collection of the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris, developed a radically new scheme of their classification, which replaced Wroth's obsolete system: Cécile Morrisson, *Catalogue des monnaies byzantines de la Bibliothèque nationale*, vol. 2, *De Philippicus à Alexis III (711–1204)* (Paris: Bibliothèque nationale, 1970). Morrisson also authored a number of articles on the history of the Byzantine monetary system in the 11th century: Eadem, *La dévaluation de la monnaie byzantine au 11. siècle: essai d'interprétation* (Paris: Éditions de Boccard, 1976); Cécile Morrisson, "La 'Logariké': réforme monétaire et réforme fiscale sous Alexis Ier Comnène," *Travaux et Mémoires* (1979), no. 7, 419–64. David Michael Metcalf (1933–2018) worked on Byzantine numismatics of the 9th to 14th centuries, including the problem of the anonymous folles: David Metcalf, *Coinage in the Balkans (820–1355)* (Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies, 1965); Idem, "The coinage of Thessaloniki, 829–1204, and its place in Balkan Monetary History," in *Balkan Studies* (1963), no. 4, 277–88; Idem, "Interpretation of the Byzantine 'Rex Regnatum' Folles of the Class 'A,'" *Numismatic chronicle* (1970), no. 10, 199–219. On the history of the cataloging of the largest collection of Byzantine coins (*Catalogue of the Byzantine Coins in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection and in the Whittemore Collection*), see: Grierson, *Byzantine Coinage*, 61–5. The editor-in-chief of this catalog, Philip Grierson (1910–2006), participated in the Byzantine studies congress in Bucharest, where he gave a paper on "Byzantine Coinage as Source Material" (in *Proceedings of the XIIIth International Congress of Byzantine Studies*, 317–33). By then, he had already published a few articles on 11th-century Byzantine numismatics: Philip Grierson, "The debasement of the Bezant in the Eleventh Century," *BZ* 47 (1954), 379–94; Idem, "Notes on the Finest of the Byzantine Solidus," *BZ* 54 (1961), 91–7.
- 114 Idem, "Coinage and Coin Finds Associated with a Military Presence in the Medieval Balkans," in *Kovanje i kovnice antičkog i srednjovekovnog novca. Materiali simpozijuma održanog od 30.I – 1.II 1975 god. u Narodnom Museju Beograd*, ed. Vladimir Kondić (Belgrade: Narodni Muzej, 1976), 88–97. David Metcalf is also known as a proponent of the widest possible use of coins as a source for the history of Byzantium: Kazhdan, "Bel'giyskiy zhurnal 'Bizantion' v 1965–1970," 192.

Seals have become one of the main sources for the study of the Byzantine administration in the region.<sup>115</sup> In 1990, Cécile Morrisson and Jean-Claude Cheynet published a brief but very important essay on interpreting the locations of Byzantine seal finds: large quantities of seals belonging to important figures turning up in the empire's borderlands indicate political turbulence or periods of intense diplomatic exchanges.<sup>116</sup>

Sigilliographic materials also supplement written evidence (the publication of the seals of Kegen and Tyrach comes to mind as an example, see above), sometimes constituting full-fledged sources.<sup>117</sup> They may occasionally reveal the existence of persons not featured in any written sources, enriching Byzantine prosopography,<sup>118</sup> or even bring to light entire institutions, such as the bishopric of Atel (τῆς Ἀτέλου), which is absent from the *Notitiae episcopatum*.<sup>119</sup>

Information from written sources may be combined with dated (or provisionally dated) seals of imperial officials to form a single prosopographic database. Telemachos Lounghis wrote about this as early as 1990.<sup>120</sup> The *Prosopography of the Byzantine World* is a good example of just such a database.<sup>121</sup> The project "Prosopography of the Middle Byzantine Period Online,"<sup>122</sup>

115 Wasilewski, "L'administration byzantine dans la vallée du Bas Danube au Xe et XIe siècles selon la sigillographie"; Alexandra-Kyriaki Wassiliou-Seibt, "Paratiriseis schetiká me tin ídrysi tou thématos Paradounávou kai tous anótatous stratiotikouís dioikítés tis," in *Holokóitnon. Melétes Vyzantinís Nomismatikís kai Sigillografías sti mními tou Pétrou Protonotariou*, eds. Eleni G. Papaefthymiou and Ioannis P. Touratsoglou (Athens: Hellenic Numismatic Society, 2013), 181–95.

116 Jean-Claude Cheynet and Cécile Morrisson, "Lieux de trouvaille et circulation des sceaux," *SBS* 2 (1990), 105–36. Cheynet's most important works are collected in: *La société byzantine. L'apport des sceaux*, 2 vols (Paris: Association des amis du Centre d'histoire et de civilisation de Byzance, 2008).

117 See, for instance, Dudek, "Pieczęć magistra Jana Kegeny jako wyraz polityki Bizancjum wobec stepowców w połowie XI w."

118 See, for instance, Īordanov, "Pechati deyateley iz 'Aleksiady,' naydennyye v Veliki-Preslave," 27–8.

119 Werner Seibt, "Ἐπίσκοπος τῆς Ἀτέλου. Residierte der Bischof von Atel in Chazaria (am Unteren Don)?" *SBS* 13 (2019), 122.

120 Telemachos C. Lounghis, "Researching Seals in a Byzantine Chronography Data Base System," *SBS* 2 (1990), 7–15. See also: Werner Seibt, "Seals and the Prosopography of the Byzantine Empire," in *Fifty Years of Prosopography: The Later Roman Empire, Byzantium and Beyond*, ed. Averil Cameron (Oxford: British Academy, 2003), 95–102.

121 *Prosopography of the Byzantine World*, 2016, eds. Michael Jeffreys et al. (King's College London, 2017). Available at <http://pbw2016.kdl.kcl.ac.uk>. Accessed on 2 February 2020.

122 *Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit Online. Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Nach Vorarbeiten F. Winkelmanns erstellt*, eds. Ralph-Johannes Lilie

on the other hand, is based on written sources. Promising work in this vein has been done by Savvides and Hendrickx.<sup>123</sup>

The second half of the 20th century witnessed not only the introduction of new sources, but also deeper critical examination of some already familiar ones. In a paper presented at the 13th International Congress of Historical Sciences in Moscow, the American Byzantinologist of Ukrainian descent Ihor Ševčenko (1922–2009), student of the renowned Belgian scholar Henri Grégoire (1881–1964),<sup>124</sup> convincingly proved that the *Toparcha Gothicus*, a source for the history of Eastern Europe in the Middle Byzantine period, was a masterful forgery created by Charles Benoît Hase.<sup>125</sup> The paper reveals curious details of the text's history. One of the French Hellenist's sponsors was Count Nikolaï Rumiantsev (1754–1826), son of Piotr Rumiantsev-Zadunayskiï (1725–96), who served as the governor of Little Russia and fought in the Russo-Turkish wars of 1768–74 and 1787–92. In 1813, Nikolaï Rumiantsev retired from the post of Foreign Minister and launched the so-called Rumiantsev Club, members of which, among other things, engaged in the study of historical sources. In his correspondence with Hase, Rumiantsev asked for primary-source information about Crimea and the region north of the Black Sea.<sup>126</sup> Hase pondered the problem. In 1819, funded by Rumiantsev,<sup>127</sup> Hase published in Paris the *History* of Leo the Deacon, which was to inform the educated public about a Rus' prince's campaigns to Bulgaria, providing a direct parallel to the Russo-Turkish wars. The notes to this edition featured a previously unknown fragment of a 10th-century work, the *Toparcha Gothicus*,<sup>128</sup> which had been "discovered" by Hase in a codex preserved at the Bibliothèque Royale in Paris. The contents<sup>129</sup> of the "report" were warlike and colonialist, depicting a group of armed men moving across the North Pontic steppes, fighting barbarians, and building a fortress. One could hardly have failed to recognize in this picture the Russian Empire's activities in conquering and colonizing Crimea and the steppes north of the Black Sea. The reader was also reminded of Russia by snowstorms

---

et al. (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2013). Available at <https://www.degruyter.com/view/db/pmbz>. Accessed on 2 February 2020.

123 *Encyclopaedic Prosopographical Lexicon of Byzantine History and Civilization (AD 300–1500)*, 3 vols, eds. Alexios Savvides, Benjamin Hendrickx et al. (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007–2013).

124 Henri Grégoire was also well known for exposing forgeries. See, for instance, Obolensky, *The Bogomils. A Study in Balkan Neo-Manichaeism*, 31.

125 Ševčenko, "The Date and Author of so-called Fragments of Toparcha Gothicus."

126 Medvedev, "Excellent Scholar – Excellent Forger: The Case of Karl Benedict Hase," 153–5.

127 *Ibid.*, 148.

128 The name "Toparcha Gothicus" was introduced in 1874.

129 Ševčenko, "The Date and Author of so-called Fragments of Toparcha Gothicus," 118–127.

and the crossing of the Dnieper, which, in Ševčenko's words, possibly echoed "Napoleon's retreat from Moscow of 1812, an event whose hardships were not forgotten in Paris by 1818."<sup>130</sup> And so, exposing one forgery not only negated the efforts of the many interpreters of the *Toparcha Gothicus*, which, as of 1971, had over 60 studies devoted to it,<sup>131</sup> but also showed once again how tightly historical scholarship was linked to politics, especially in the 19th century.

At a symposium on Byzantine studies in Cambridge in 1990, Ihor Ševčenko, in his signature manner of an intellectual endowed with both scholarly and literary talents, delivered a paper in the person of Constantine Porphyrogenitus.<sup>132</sup> In it, as noted by Mark Whittow, he opened the way for a reassessment of the *DAI* and the emperor's other works.<sup>133</sup>

Edward Louis Keenan (1935–2015), a student of Omeljan Pritsak, in his *Josef Dobrovský and the Origins of the Igor' Tale* questioned the ancient provenance of this text – a source for nomadic and Rus' history and one of the few specimens of pre-Mongol Rus' literature.<sup>134</sup> Oleksiï Tolochko has put a full stop to the debate about the authenticity of the "new" evidence for the history of Eastern Europe found in Vasilii Tatishchev's *Russian History*.<sup>135</sup>

However, source criticism is not just about detecting forgeries. Paul Gautier (1931–83) introduced scholars to the works of Manuel Straboromanos, who wrote about the Pechenegs crossing the Ister and occupying all of Moesia.<sup>136</sup> In addition to editing sources for the history of 11th-century Byzantium, he prepared an index to Bernard Leib's edition of the *Alexiad*.<sup>137</sup> Gautier was also not indifferent to the problem of the chronology of Byzantine-nomadic relations. In the introduction to his edition of Theophylact of Ohrid's speech addressed to Alexios I Komnenos, he attempted to re-date both the speech itself (to 1088, as opposed to Vasilievskii's 1090) and, accordingly, the war and peace with the Pechenegs, which Vasilievskii had dated to the end of 1089 and Gautier now located in early winter of 1087/88.<sup>138</sup> In a substantial study of the

130 Ibid., 166.

131 Medvedev, "Excellent Scholar – Excellent Forger: The Case of Karl Benedict Hase," 145.

132 Ševčenko, "Re-reading Constantine Porphyrogenitus."

133 Whittow, *The Making of Byzantium, 600–1025*, 426.

134 Edward Keenan, *Josef Dobrovský and the Origins of the Igor' Tale* (Harvard: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 2004).

135 Oleksiï P. Tolochko, "Istoriya Rossyiskaya" *Vasiliya Tatishcheva: istochniki i izvestiya*.

136 Paul Gautier, "Le dossier d'un haut fonctionnaire byzantin d'Alexis Ier Comnène, Manuel Straboromanos," *RÉB* 23 (1965), 190.

137 Anna Comnèna, *Alexiade: Règne de l'empereur Alexis I Comnène, 1081–1118*, vol. 4, *Index*, ed. Paul Gautier (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1976).

138 Gautier, "Le Discours de Théophylacte de Bulgarie à l'autocrator Alexis I-er Comnène (6 janvier 1088)," 96–9. In Lyubarskii's view, Gautier's chief contribution lay less in



prosopography of the Synod of Blachernae (1094), Gautier disputed the dating of the confiscation of church treasures by Alexios I, suggesting that it happened in late 1087, after the defeat of the Byzantines near Drüstür.<sup>139</sup> He also proposed a new date for the last Cuman raid on Byzantium in the 11th century (early 1095)<sup>140</sup> and compiled prosopographic sketches of a number of participants in Byzantium's struggles against its nomadic neighbors – Georges Palaeologus, Constantin Humpertos, Tatikios, Niketas Kastamonites, Georges Pyrrhos, and others. Gautier opposed the dating of the solar eclipse written about by Anna Komnene in the context of the Byzantine-Pecheneg war of 1084 (the Drüstür campaign).<sup>141</sup> The scholar extensively used episodes of Byzantine-Pecheneg and Byzantine-Cuman conflicts in dating other events of the 11th century.<sup>142</sup> He also rarely missed a chance to comment on new editions of sources for the history of Byzantium in the 11th century or monographic studies on the subject,<sup>143</sup> including Petre Diaconu's books on the Pechenegs and Cumans on the Lower Danube (see above).

After Alexandr Kazhdan dated two of Ioannes Mauropous' speeches (or homilies), *Orationes* 181 and 182, to 1047 and thus proposed a new chronology of the relations in the triangle Kegen-Tyrach-Byzantium (see above), the British historian Jonathan Shepard came out against Kazhdan's arguments. In his view, the *Orationes* 181 and 182 should instead be dated to 1044 and much later, because the word *Πάσχα*, which Kazhdan used as dating evidence, could also be understood as "all the Ferias of the Great Week," rather than just Easter

---

offering new dates for these events than in demonstrating the shakiness of the old dating: Yakov Lyubarskiĭ, "[Review of:] Gautier P., 'Le discours de Théophylacte de Bulgarie à l'autocrator Alexis I-er Comnène (6 janvier 1088)' « RĖB », XX, 1962, p. 93–130," *VizVrem* 25 (1964), 269–70.

139 Gautier, "Le synode des Blachernes (fin 1094). Etude prosopographique," 216.

140 Ibid., 280–4. However, Gautier for some reason considered the Pechenegs a sedentary people, as opposed to the Cumans: Ibid., 283.

141 Ferrari d'Occhieppo, "Zur Identifizierung der Sonnenfinsternis während des Petschenegenkrieges Alexios' I. Komnenos (1084)"; Gautier, "Réquisitoire du patriarche Jean d'Antioche contre le charisticariat," 82. Thanks to this piece by Gautier, Ioannes Oxeites' treatise on the practice of *charistikion* was added to the pool of sources for Pecheneg and Cuman history: Ibid., 128–9; Idem, "Diatribes de Jean l'Oxite contre Alexis Ier Comnène," *RĖB* 28 (1970), 5–55.

142 Ibid., 215 and 281; Paul Gautier, "Réquisitoire du patriarche Jean d'Antioche contre le charisticariat," *RĖB* 33 (1975), 83.

143 See, for instance, Idem, "[Review of:] *Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsis Historiarum*. Editio princeps. Recensuit Ioannes Thurn," *RĖB* 33 (1975), 306–8; Idem, "[Review of:] P. Lemerle, 'Cinq études sur le XIe siècle byzantine,'" *RĖB* 36 (1978), 283–5; Idem, "[Review of:] A.A. Glavinas, *I epí Alexiōu Komnīnoū (1081–1118) perī ierōn skevōn, keimīlōn kaí agīon eikōnon ēris (1081–1095)*," *RĖB* 32 (1974), 413–6.

Sunday. Furthermore, in the speech on Leo Tornikios, Shepard detected three armies (“northern,” “barbaric,” and “metropolitan”), as opposed to Kazhdan’s two (“Constantinopolitan” and “northern barbaric”). As for the “barbarian” allies, Shepard believed they could be identified as the *μικροβάρβαροι* of the Danube region, mentioned by Attaleiates. Based on all this, Shepard argued that the winter of 1048/49 as the date of the mass crossing of the Danube by the nomads was correct after all.<sup>144</sup> Kazhdan quickly responded,<sup>145</sup> but Shepard maintained his view.<sup>146</sup> Disputes over this question seem to have subsided in the wake of an article by Jacques Lefort (1939–2014). December 1046/January 1047 has been agreed upon as the date of the Pecheneg invasion across the frozen Danube.<sup>147</sup>

At the Byzantine studies congress in Athens (1976), Shepard suggested that Katakalon Kekaumenos was Skylitzes’ source for the *Synopsis Historion*.<sup>148</sup> In support of his argument, he cited the author’s (or his source’s) detailed knowledge of the empire’s Pecheneg affairs.<sup>149</sup> Shepard also had no doubt that the savior of Kekaumenos was Κουλίνος/Γουλίνος, the son of the Pecheneg chief-tain Kegen.<sup>150</sup> In his article “Byzantinorussica,” the historian writes that the *Rhos archontes* mentioned by Skylitzes – Nesisthlabos, Hierosthlabos, and Zinisthlabos – were Byzantine generals who fought against the Pechenegs in 1036. Two of them were killed, and Zinisthlabos was chosen in their place.<sup>151</sup>

144 Shepard, “John Mauropous, Leo Tornicius and Alleged Russian Army.”

145 Kazhdan, “Once More About the ‘Alleged’ Russo-Byzantine Treaty (ca. 1047).”

146 Jonathan Shepard, “Why Did the Russians Attack Byzantium in 1043?” *BNJ* 22 (1978–1979), 167.

147 Lefort, “Rhétorique et politique. Trois discours de Jean Mauropous en 1047,” 274–5.

148 Jonathan Shepard, “A Suspected Source of Scylitzes’ *Synopsis Historion*: The Great Catacalon Cecaumenos,” *BMGS* 16 (1992), 171–81.

149 Shepard argues that the seal of Katakalon Kekaumenos as the *magistros kai doux* of Antioch, found in the Balkans (?), indicates that he had friendly relations with the northerners (Shepard, “Mingling with Northern Barbarians: Advantages and Perils,” 224). However, the place of its discovery is unknown (Ilarion Svetsits’kyi notes that it was a chance purchase (*Gelegenheitskauf*) in Budapest in 1913; Svetsits’kyi, “Byzantinische Bleisiegel in den Sammlungen von Lwow,” 434). Considering the active diplomatic relations between Austria-Hungary and Turkey before 1914, this seal might have been acquired in Turkey and found in its Asian part. Īordanov asserts that we lack sigillographic evidence to properly confirm a connection between Katakalon Kekaumenos and the Byzantine administration of Paradunavon: Īordanov, “The Katepanate of Paradounavon according to the Sphragistic Data,” 64.

150 Shepard, “A Suspected Source of Scylitzes’ *Synopsis Historion*: The Great Catacalon Cecaumenos,” 172.

151 Idem, “Byzantinorussica,” *RĒB* 33 (1975), 211–5.

Shepard's observations on the Soviet edition of the *DAI* by Litavrin and Novosel'tsev also deserve notice.<sup>152</sup>

### 3 Visions

A student of Dimitri Obolensky,<sup>153</sup> Jonathan Shepard adopted, and in some ways expanded on, his mentor's concept of the Byzantine Commonwealth.<sup>154</sup> Using such instruments as the baptism and coronation of neighboring barbarian rulers, the Byzantine emperors strove to create around themselves their own, understandable world with which they could have civilized relations, negotiate, and conclude dynastic marriages. After baptism, barbarians ceased to be "Scythians";<sup>155</sup> they could take an oath and be a "relatively structured power,"<sup>156</sup> while the non-baptized Pechenegs' fidelity to their obligations could only be secured (to an extent) by taking hostages from among their midst.<sup>157</sup> Baptism opened the way for trade and intelligence gathering.<sup>158</sup> Hence the Byzantines tried to baptize even those barbarian chieftains who were not leading figures in their own lands.<sup>159</sup> However, as Shepard notes, "matters stood rather differently in the wider world of the steppes and the northern forest zones."<sup>160</sup> The Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans of the 10th and 11th centuries were not members of the Byzantine Commonwealth, even though they were part of

- 
- 152 Idem, "[Review of:] *Konstantin Bagryanorodnyy. Ob upravlenii imperiyey*. Edition of the text, translation and commentary by G.G. Litavrin, A.P. Novosel'tsev and others," *BS* 52 (1991), 148–54.
- 153 Under his direction, Shepard wrote a dissertation on Russo-Byzantine relations in the 11th century: Jonathan Shepard, *Byzantium and Russia in the Eleventh Century: A Study in Political and Ecclesiastical Relationships* [Ph.D. thesis] (Oxford, 1973).
- 154 Idem, "The Byzantine Commonwealth 1000–1550," in *The Cambridge History of Christianity*, vol. 5, ed. Michael Angold (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 1–52.
- 155 "Who has healed the parts of the world that were split apart and thus brought them together in wholeness and continuity, where we are no longer called 'Scythian' or 'barbarian' or I know not what, but may be named and shown to be Christians and sons of God and travail of the Spirit?": Ivan Duichev, "On the Treaty of 927 with the Bulgarians," *DOP* 32 (1978), 265.
- 156 Shepard, "Mingling with Northern Barbarians: Advantages and Perils," 225.
- 157 *Ibid.*, 233.
- 158 Idem, "Byzantine Writers on the Hungarians in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries," *Annual of Medieval Studies at the CEU* 10 (2004), 119.
- 159 As in the cases of Bulchu and Gyula: Panagiotis G. Antonopoulos, "Byzantium, the Magyar Raids and Their Consequences," *BS* 54 (1993), no. 2, 263.
- 160 Shepard, "The Byzantine Commonwealth 1000–1550," 28.

the Byzantine *oikumene*. Religion did not play a significant part in Byzantium's choice of allies in the northern steppes.<sup>161</sup> Furthermore, in Shepard's studies nomads figure as merely objects of the empire's foreign policy or political calculations of individual Byzantine generals,<sup>162</sup> never really wielding agency in such relationships, although at times nomadic leaders were well aware of and tried to exploit Byzantium's domestic problems.<sup>163</sup>

Based, among others, on Ševčenko's already-mentioned paper on the works of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, Shepard reconsiders the importance of the *DAI*'s testimony on the peoples of Eastern Europe in the historical perspective. In his view, the author of this work was poorly educated; furthermore, in the years 920–944 he languished in the shadow of his co-ruler Romanos I and was not admitted to the affairs of state.<sup>164</sup> Constantine Porphyrogenitus' reports on the Pechenegs and Hungarians are rife with inaccuracies and distortions; he cannot name the Pecheneg rulers of his day, but knows the names of their predecessors, which may be explained by his use of materials from the time of the Bulgaro-Byzantine war of 894–897.<sup>165</sup> Shepard also doubts that the Pechenegs long preserved their importance for the empire, noted in the *DAI*. In his view, Constantine describes not so much a doctrine as a “snap-shot of ever-shifting sands.”<sup>166</sup>

The British historian barely considers Pecheneg-Byzantine bilateral interaction in the 10th century, but instead attempts to form a coherent picture of the relations in the polygon Byzantium – the Pechenegs – Khazaria – the Hungarians (Hungary) – Rus' – Bulgaria, not forgetting about the possibility of the empire using nomads in its internal wrangles. Thus, analysing Byzantium's enlistment of the Pechenegs as allies against the Bulgarians, Shepard looks beyond Constantinople's diplomatic struggle to keep the Pechenegs on its side<sup>167</sup> and takes into consideration domestic political intrigues. He believes Romanos Lekapenos may have deliberately delayed bringing the Pechenegs into the fray during the Battle at Acheloos in order to use the defeat to seize power in the empire.<sup>168</sup> Writing about Pecheneg-Byzantine trade, Shepard also

161 Idem, “The Khazars' Formal Adoption of Judaism and Byzantium's Northern Policy,” *Oxford Slavonic Papers* 31 (1998), 28–9.

162 See: Idem, “Mingling with Northern Barbarians: Advantages and Perils.”

163 Ibid., 232.

164 Idem, “Byzantine Writers on the Hungarians in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries,” 102.

165 Ibid., 11–3.

166 Jonathan Shepard, “Constantine VII's Doctrine of ‘Containment’ of the Rus’,” in *ΓΕΝΝΑΔΙΟΣ: κ 70-letiyu akademika G.G. Litavrina*, 277.

167 Idem, “Symeon's Confrontation with Byzantium c. 917: Diplomatic Ripples across Eurasia,” in *Simeonova Bŭlgariya*, 12–3.

168 Idem, “Mingling with Northern Barbarians: Advantages and Perils,” 233.

draws attention to the Rus' factor: the Pechenegs not only plundered caravans from Rus', but also competed with the Rus' commercially. Having received baptism, Prince Volodimir intensified trade in the southern direction and became Byzantium's number one ally in the North Pontic steppes, replacing the Pechenegs in this role. This alliance with Rus', or rather absence of danger from Rus', allowed Basil II to significantly cut back on the military presence in the Lower Danube region at the turn of the 11th century.<sup>169</sup>

The seizure of Cherson by Volodimir impoverished it and deprived the Pechenegs of opportunities for commerce or plunder in the city and its environs. Rus' monopolized trade in the region.<sup>170</sup> Shepard elaborates on this issue in the book *The Emergence of Rus'*, coauthored with Simon Franklin. Adopting Arnold J. Toynbee's concept of "challenge and response," the authors link the very emergence of so-called Middle-Dnieper Rus' with the task of protecting the route to Byzantium against the Pechenegs.<sup>171</sup>

At the 19th International Congress of Byzantine Studies in Copenhagen (1996), Shepard delivered a paper on the role of the Hungarians in checking the nomadic threat to Byzantium.<sup>172</sup> In his view, the Hungarians had great potential for deterring the Pechenegs and Uzes, given the similarity of their weaponry and military tactics and the possibility of settling captive (or allied) nomads on their lands as border guards.<sup>173</sup> However, the Hungarian king could not come to Byzantium's aid during the critical years of the late 1040s to early 1050s, because he had serious problems of his own.<sup>174</sup> He was also indebted to the Pechenegs (possibly those residing in Hungary, rather than north of the Black Sea) for help in repelling a German aggression in 1051.<sup>175</sup> Thus, the Hungarians could no longer fulfill for Constantinople the role they had played in the times of Tsar Simeon, namely that of a counterweight to Byzantium's northern

169 Idem, "Information, Disinformation and Delay in Byzantine Diplomacy," *BF* 10 (1985), 254–9.

170 Idem, "The Russian Steppe-Frontier and the Black Sea Zone," 221.

171 Franklin and Shepard, *The Emergence of Rus 750–1200*, 112–38.

172 Shepard, "Byzantium and the Steppe-Nomads: The Hungarian Dimension." See also: Andrew B. Urbansky, *Byzantium and the Danube Frontier. A Study of the Relations between Byzantium, Hungary and the Balkans during the Period of the Comneni* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1968).

173 Shepard believes that the Uzes, after their defeat in the war against the Byzantines in 1064, were settled in the domains of the king of Hungary, *ton Myrmidonon archon*, although Vasilievskii saw a Rus' prince in this role: Shepard, "Byzantium and the Steppe-Nomads: The Hungarian Dimension," 66.

174 Cheynet shares this view: Jean-Claude Cheynet, "L'Empire byzantin et la Hongrie dans la seconde moitié du XIe siècle," *Acta Historiae Artium* 43 (2002), no. 1, 8.

175 Shepard, "Byzantium and the Steppe-Nomads: The Hungarian Dimension," 63–4.

adversaries (in 894–897, these adversaries were the Bulgarians).<sup>176</sup> Instead, they carried out their own raids on the empire, both provoked (1071) and unprovoked (1059). Despite this, Shepard believes that an agreement was reached between Byzantium and Hungary in the 1060s against the steppe peoples;<sup>177</sup> in support of this view, he cites the marriage between Synadene and the king of Hungary and the gift of the so-called Crown of St Stephen.<sup>178</sup>

In his dissertation, defended at Cambridge in 1995, Shepard's student Paul Stephenson drew on the ideas of Obolensky and Shepard and (at least in part) on research by archaeologists and specialists in numismatics and sigillography from the countries of the Balkan-Danubian region.<sup>179</sup>

Stephenson emphasizes that for the Byzantine emperors of this period it was less important to have the full use of the rather poor border regions, such as the territory between the Haemus and Danube,<sup>180</sup> than to maintain peace on the borders, control trade and military routes, and ensure a secure exploitation of the wealth of such core Byzantine provinces as Thrace and Thessaly and the hubs of advanced commerce and industry in the major cities.<sup>181</sup> Hence, something like a demilitarized zone was formed between the Haemus and Danube<sup>182</sup> – or what Obolensky would have characterized as a *limen*. Building on Shepard's ideas about the trilateral relations between Rus', Byzantium, and the Pechenegs, Stephenson writes that the recurrent wars between Prince Volodimir's Rus' and the Pechenegs kept the nomads away from Byzantium's Danubian border. The Russo-Pecheneg wars allowed Basil II to concentrate his army for war against the Bulgarians.<sup>183</sup> At the same time, Volodimir's efforts

176 Fine, *The Early Medieval Balkans: A Critical Survey from the Sixth to the Late Twelfth Century*, 137–40.

177 Shepard, "Byzantium and the Steppe-Nomads: The Hungarian Dimension," 72.

178 *Ibid.*, 72–3.

179 In 2000, the dissertation was published as a book: Stephenson, *Byzantium's Balkan Frontier*. Reviews: Alexandru Madgearu, "Rethinking the Byzantine Balkans. A Recent Book on the 10th–12th Centuries"; Florin Curta, in *Balkan Academic Book Review*, 2000, 22; Jean-Claude Cheynet, in *RÉB* 59 (2001), 299; Mark Bartusis, in *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 34 (2002), 10–2.

180 Stephenson, *Byzantium's Balkan Frontier*, 83. In his review, Cheynet disputes this statement, citing names of Byzantine officials in the Balkans, including Paristrion, who were first-rank figures in the Byzantine state, sometimes even future emperors: Jean-Claude Cheynet, "[Review of:] Paul Stephenson, *Byzantium's Balkan Frontier. A Political Study of the Northern Balkans, 900–1204*," *RÉB* 59 (2001), 299.

181 Stephenson, *Byzantium's Balkan Frontier*, 317.

182 *Ibid.*, 82.

183 *Idem*, "The Balkan Frontier in the Year 1000," 129.

to strengthen his border defenses did force the Pechenegs to seek new targets for raiding.<sup>184</sup>

Purely military methods would not have worked for ensuring control over the region, as they would have required the continued maintenance of a vast army, which the imperial treasury could ill afford.<sup>185</sup> Basil II built a system of defense that included small garrisons in the fortresses along the Danubian border (Preslav, Dristra, Presthlavitsa (Nufăru?), Noviodunum, Dinogetia, Capidava, and Dervent), a no-man's land between the Lower Danube and Haemus Mountains, and a number of client "principalities."<sup>186</sup> An important condition for the effectiveness of this system was peace on the eastern border.<sup>187</sup>

After the death of Basil II, the Danubian border defense system introduced by him fell apart<sup>188</sup> and a new defense conception became needed. One of the innovations of the mid-11th century was the strategy defined by Stephenson as "trading, not raiding."<sup>189</sup> The Byzantines sought to maintain peaceful dealings with various invaders (including the Hungarians,<sup>190</sup> Pechenegs,<sup>191</sup> or other nomads) by granting their leaders titles and substantial funds in the form of periodic payments, as well as creating conditions for trade that aimed to give the nomads access to luxury goods by means other than raiding.<sup>192</sup> This idea may be seen as a continuation of what Obolensky called "economic cajolery."<sup>193</sup> At the same time, individual emperors could have their own methods for appeasing barbarians – either economic, or cultural, or military.<sup>194</sup> In the event, Alexios I would again have to rely on diplomacy and military force to overcome the nomadic threat.<sup>195</sup>

184 Stephenson, *Byzantium's Balkan Frontier*, 63 and 81.

185 *Ibid.*, 81.

186 *Idem*, "The Balkan Frontier in the Year 1000," 126. Stephenson devoted a special study to the reign of Basil II: *Idem*, *The Legend of Basil the Bulgar-Slayer* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press 2003). John Haldon describes the Byzantine defense strategy on the Danubian border during the times of Basil II in similar terms: John Haldon, *Warfare, State and Society in the Byzantine World, 565–1204* (London: Routledge, 1999), 64.

187 *Idem*, "The Balkan Frontier in the Year 1000," 129.

188 In the words of Stephenson, "in any event Byzantine control of the north-eastern and western Balkans was short-lived": *Idem*, "The Balkan Frontier in the Year 1000," 110.

189 *Idem*, "Byzantine Policy towards Paristrion in the Mid-Eleventh Century: Another Interpretation," *BMGS* 23 (1999), 43–66; *Idem*, *Byzantium's Balkan Frontier*, 41 and 43.

190 *Ibid.*, 41–5.

191 *Ibid.*, 83–8.

192 *Ibid.*, 83.

193 Obolensky, "The Principles and Methods of Byzantine Diplomacy," 52.

194 Stephenson, *Byzantium's Balkan Frontier*, 115.

195 *Ibid.*, 100–5.

From the times of Ioannes I Tzimiskes and Basil II, Byzantium strove to rely on the local elites in its policies in the Balkan borderlands.<sup>196</sup> Stephenson wants to show that the Pechenegs and their leaders were considered by the imperial authorities on an equal footing with the Slavic peoples of the Balkans and their rulers. In particular, he emphasizes the fact, known from the *De Ceremoniis*, that the *archontes* of the Pechenegs, like the rulers of Moravia, the Magyars, the Serbs, and the Croats, received imperial letters sealed with golden bulls valued at two solidi.<sup>197</sup> Even so, Stephenson does not count Pecheneg chieftains among the local elites of Paristrion in the second half of the 11th century, drawing a distinction between “frontier elites” and “barbarian warlords.”<sup>198</sup>

Possibly the main purpose of Stephenson’s book was to prove that Byzantium’s control over the Balkans was not total and that it stimulated the development of ethnic identities and local elites, which eventually, with the weakening of imperial power, began to show centrifugal tendencies, seeking, among other things, support in the West.<sup>199</sup> Still, he cautions against interpreting the emergence of regional political entities free from subordination to Constantinople as a manifestation of the Balkan peoples’ desire to rid themselves of “the Byzantine yoke.” He sees nothing “national” in these developments,<sup>200</sup> as opposed to such historians of the old school as, for instance, Zlatarski, for whom the establishment of the Second Bulgarian Empire in a struggle against Byzantium was a direct counterpart to the national liberation movement of the Bulgarian people against the Ottoman Porte. Thus, the realities of the 19th century were transposed into the world of the 10th to 12th. This trend persisted far into the 20th century.<sup>201</sup>

Élisabeth Malamut, a student of Hélène Ahrweiler, authored perhaps the most cited work on the subject of Byzantium and the Pechenegs in modern historiography.<sup>202</sup> Malamut offers a chronological study of the 10th- to 12th-century Byzantine testimony on the Pechenegs. Step by step, she first sketches out the historical progression of Pecheneg-Byzantine relations and then

196 Ibid., 9 and 80; Paul Stephenson, “Balkan Borderlands (1018–1204),” *CHBE*, 664–9.

197 Idem, *Byzantium’s Balkan Frontier*, 36.

198 Ibid., 116.

199 Ibid., 281.

200 Ibid. Writing about the administrative organization of Byzantine Paradunavon, Stephenson notes that “much of the literature devoted to this issue has reflected modern national interests”: Idem, “The Balkan Frontier in the Year 1000,” 115.

201 See, for instance, Dimitŭr Angelov, *Bŭlgariŭt v srednovkovieto (svetogled, ideologiya, dushevnost)* (Varna: Georgi Bakalov, 1985), 281 and 287; Sergei A. Ivanov, “Bolgarskaya apokrificheskaya letopis’ kak pamyatnik etnicheskogo samosoznaniya bolgar,” in *Razvitiye etnicheskogo samosoznaniya slavyanskikh narodov v epokhu zrelogo feodalizma*, 70–7.

202 Malamut, “L’image byzantine des Petchénègues.”



reconstructs the image of the Pechenegs that prevailed in the Byzantine literature of the period. It should be noted here that this image is distilled from works of different authors and different periods; thus, for the first half of the 10th century Malamut turns to the patriarch of Constantinople Nicholas I (852–925) and Constantine Porphyrogenitus (905–959), men of not only different generations, but also diverging outlooks, Christian and statist respectively. The emperor, unlike the patriarch, did not distinguish between the Christianized Scythians and pagans and reproached his co-ruler for the idea of a dynastic marriage alliance with the Bulgarian tsar. According to the *DAI*, the Pechenegs were insatiable and unfaithful and had no centralized authority. Malamut finds similar statements in Byzantine authors' descriptions of other nations.<sup>203</sup> She also mistrusts Leo the Deacon's characterization of the Pechenegs as lice eaters. Some other Pecheneg culinary habits, reported by Attaleiates and Psellos, may similarly have come from works of ancient authors.<sup>204</sup> On the whole, the image of the Pechenegs during this period presented a dramatic contrast to that of the God-fearing Romans, and increasingly assumed the features of an enemy: a violent plunderer and murderer who did not honor pacts and covenants. The traits with which Byzantine authors endowed the Pechenegs were also attributed to other barbarian peoples, namely the Avars, Magyars, Bulgarians, and so forth.<sup>205</sup>

Gradually, the Byzantines began to realize just how dangerous these steppe dwellers could be. The threat culminated in the invasion launched by Tyrach's Pechenegs in 1046. What was it that helped to stop the deluge? A mysterious disease, the description of which Skylitzes may have "borrowed" from a tale of the Frankish chieftain Boutelinos? Divine intervention? Or the strength of the Byzantine army, as Ioannes Mauropous told it?<sup>206</sup>

In the events of 1072, Malamut sees the beginning of the Pecheneg practice of intervention into the empire's internal squabbles<sup>207</sup> – the topic also touched upon by Shepard.<sup>208</sup> It was really a two-way street: while the Pechenegs sought

203 Ibid., 115.

204 Ibid., 117 and 122.

205 See: Élisabeth Malamut, "Les peuples étrangers dans l'idéologie impériale. Scythes et Occidentaux," in *L'étranger au Moyen Âge. Actes des congrès de la Société des historiens médiévistes de l'enseignement supérieur public, 30-e congrès, Göttingen, 1999* (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 2000), 122.

206 Malamut, "L'image byzantine des Petchénègues," 120.

207 Ibid., 131.

208 "Nomad leaders could understand and manipulate the empire's internal problems": Shepard, "Mingling with Northern Barbarians: Advantages and Perils," 232.

to back rebels, some Byzantine citizens (Nestor, Lekas, Traulos), in their turn, offered the nomads their services as guides.

Describing the 1072 uprising in Paristrion, linked with the suspension of payments from Constantinople, Malamut sets forth her own hypothesis as to the identity of the mysterious *μιξοβάρβαροι* of Byzantine texts. Eugen Stănescu raised the issue in 1965,<sup>209</sup> but his theory did not find much support. Discussion in scholarly periodicals, with contributions from Obolensky,<sup>210</sup> Tanaşoca,<sup>211</sup> Tüpkova-Zaimova,<sup>212</sup> and others, led to a consensus of sorts, according to which *μιξοβάρβαροι* was not an alternative name for any of the peoples then living in the province of Paristrion, but rather a term denoting the ethnic hodgepodge in the region, which was possibly even beginning to acquire some features of a new people (“neue Entitäten”).<sup>213</sup> Malamut also speaks of *peuples mêlés*, mixed peoples.<sup>214</sup> The Slovenian Byzantinologist Jadran Ferluga (1920–2004), on the other hand, is skeptical about the possibility of nomads and farmers mixing together.<sup>215</sup>

Malamut also considers the efforts to integrate the Pechenegs into the Byzantine world through their acceptance of the imperial laws (including taxes), the duty of military service, and baptism. She calls Byzantium a “remarquable machine à intégrer,”<sup>216</sup> but admits that this machine did fail

209 Stănescu, “Les ‘Mixobarbares’ du Bas-Danube au XIe siècle. (Quelques problèmes de la terminologie des textes).”

210 Obolensky, “Byzantine Frontier Zones and Cultural Exchanges,” 312.

211 Tanaşoca, “Les Mixobarbares et les formations politiques paristriennes du XIe siècle.”

212 Tüpkova-Zaimova, “La population du Bas-Danube et le pouvoir Byzantin (XIe–XIIe s.).”

213 Fiedler, “Zur Suche nach dem archäologischen Niederschlag von Petschenegen,” 280; Bonarek, “Le Bas Danube dans la seconde moitié du XIème siècle: nouveaux États ou nouveaux peuples?” 199; Meško, *Obnova byzantskej moci na Balkáne za vlády Alexia I. Komnena*, 224.

214 Malamut, “L’image byzantine des Petchénègues,” 130. In my view, the answer to the question about the identity of the *μιξοβάρβαροι* must be sought for in the context of those events, periods, and lands in connection with which they figure in our sources; we should refrain from drawing parallels with the use of this term in other Greek texts. In the 12th century, for instance, the word was used to describe the inhabitants of Asia Minor, who were not homogeneous in either religion or economic practices: Alexios Savvides, *Vyzantiná stasiastiká kai aftonomistiká kinímata sta Dodekánisa kai sti Mikrá Asía 1189 – c.1240 m.Ch.* (Athens: Domos, 1987), 239–40.

215 Jadran Ferluga, “Quelques problèmes de politique byzantine de colonisation au XIe siècle dans les Balkans,” *BF* 7 (1979), 55–6.

216 Malamut, “Les peuples étrangers dans l’idéologie impériale. Scythes et Occidentaux,” 132. See also: Pedro Bádenas, “L’intégration des Turcs dans la société byzantine (XIe–XIIe siècles). Echecs d’un processus de coexistence,” in *Byzantine Asia Minor (6th–12th Cent.)*, ed. Stelios Sampakis (Hellenism: Ancient, Medieval, Modern, 27) (Athens: Institute for Byzantine Research, 1998), 179–88.

every now and then, especially when it was called upon to digest new and new waves of barbarians. On the one hand, Byzantine historians showed through many examples the failure of the policies of integration; on the other, the Pechenegs, in whole or in part, more and more often found themselves on Constantinople's side in conflicts with the Hungarians or Uzes, in addition to receiving regular payments from emperors and partly converting to sedentary life.<sup>217</sup> Malamut believes that, in the event, the prolonged and bloody wars of the 1080s made integration impossible,<sup>218</sup> at least until the nomads could be subdued by military force. After their defeat in 1091, at least some of them adopted Christianity;<sup>219</sup> after each victory over the Pechenegs, the Byzantines enlisted them in their army.<sup>220</sup> There were also examples of the "personal" integration of Pechenegs (?) during the reign of Alexios Komnenos<sup>221</sup> – namely the stories of Argyros Karatzas, Kantzous, Katranes, and Neantzes. While the first three "Scythians" remained faithful to the emperor, the last one betrayed him.

Obolensky names Christianity, respect for Roman law and customs, and recognition of the universal authority of the Roman emperor as the main conditions for a people's inclusion in the Byzantine Commonwealth; Malamut, invoking the words of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, adds language to this list.<sup>222</sup>

Paul Meinrad Strässle sets himself a somewhat different task: to describe the image of the Pechenegs as enemies and analyse its linguistic and stylistic elements and contents. Some examples of this include depictions of the Pechenegs as actual or potential enemies on the battlefield and stereotypes, clichés, or *topoi*

217 Malamut, "L'image byzantine des Petchénègues," 129 and 132. Attempts to sedentarize nomads from beyond the Danube in the 11th and 12th centuries were also discussed by Peter Wirth: Peter Wirth, "Die Bevölkerungspolitik der Komnenen- und Laskaridenkaiser," *BF* 7 (1979), 205–8.

218 Malamut, "L'image byzantine des Petchénègues," 139.

219 *Ibid.*, 142.

220 *Ibid.*, 146.

221 Meško explains the appearance of commanders of nomadic background in the ranks of the Byzantine army during the reign of Alexios Komnenos by their intimate knowledge of the military tactics of the steppe: Meško, *Obnova byzantskej moci na Balkáne za vlády Alexia I. Komnéna*, 229.

222 Malamut, "Les peuples étrangers dans l'idéologie impériale. Scythes et Occidentaux," 120. The episode of Alexios Komnenos' betrayal by Neantzes is also notable – having set out on a reconnaissance mission, the latter converses with the Pechenegs in their language and divulges the emperor's plans and the size of his army: Malamut, "L'image byzantine des Petchénègues," 145. Reinsch writes that Anna Komnene intentionally called the Pechenegs "barbarians" in order to stress the Byzantines' cultural superiority over them specifically as a language community: Diether Reinsch, "Ausländer und Byzantiner im Werk der Anna Komnene," *Rechtshistorisches Journal* 8 (1989), 261.

relating to them.<sup>223</sup> He assumes the “normality” (*Normalität*) of the Romans and “abnormality” (*Nichtnormalität*) of their opponents and enumerates the disagreeable traits ascribed to the Pechenegs by the Byzantines: treachery, baseness, arrogance, boastfulness, greed and insatiability, cruelty, and imperturbability.<sup>224</sup> Large numbers, mobility, cruelty, endurance, unpredictability, and an innate understanding of military tactics were features of the Pechenegs as warriors.<sup>225</sup> Strässle points out that all these epithets were quite cliché, especially comparisons with different animals and insects, such as dogs, bees, or locusts, which were intended to humiliate the enemy, to show that he was something in between human and animal.<sup>226</sup>

Understandably, the Byzantines set themselves against barbarians as better in both moral and military terms. They spoke a cultured language, Greek (*ἑλληνίζειν*). The state of the Romans was by its nature destined to rule over the “Scythians” of the North (the Pechenegs and Cumans), the “Celts” of the West, and the “Ismailites” of the East. In his work, Strässle describes victories over the Pechenegs not only as victories of the emperor and his generals, but also those of the whole army and the people of God (*Gottesvolk*).<sup>227</sup>

Lia Raffaella Cresci published a special essay on the image of the “Scythians” in the *History* of Michael Attaleiates.<sup>228</sup> In her view, Attaleiates avoided stereotyping the Pechenegs; unlike Ioannes Mauropous, he did not believe that baptism could change them and pinned his hopes on military force in dealing with them.<sup>229</sup> Cresci, unlike Malamut, finds no sharp contrast between the descriptions of Byzantine-Pecheneg relations in Skylitzes and Attaleiates. Given the fact that Attaleiates participated in Romanos Diogenes’ campaign to Asia Minor, his observations on the ethnic and social affinity between the Seljuk Turks and Pechenegs are also valuable.

Florin Curta expresses reasonable skepticism about the accuracy of the 11th-century Byzantine descriptions of the Pechenegs. According to him, despite the long residence of this people within the borders of the empire, extensive contacts, and the presence of Byzantine informers in their midst, “Byzantine authors preferred to remain silent or employ instead the ethnographic

223 Paul M. Strässle, “Das Feindbild der Petschenegen im Byzanz der Komnenen (11./12. Jh.),” *BF* 28 (2004), 297–313.

224 *Ibid.*, 302–3.

225 *Ibid.*, 304.

226 *Ibid.*, 307.

227 *Ibid.*, 311–3.

228 Lia Raffaella Cresci, “Michele Attaliata e gli ἔθνη scitici,” *Néa Róme* (2004), no. 1, 185–207.

229 *Ibid.*, 203–4.

stereotypes about nomads.”<sup>230</sup> The fact that combing through the body of Byzantine sources yields only scant bits and scraps of information about the Pechenegs’ economic life illustrates Curta’s view. Of course, Leo the Deacon, Ioannes Skylitzes, Michael Attaleiates, Anna Komnene, Ioannes Mauropous, and Michael Psellos confirm that the Pechenegs were nomads, and Constantine Porphyrogenitus also speaks of cattle trade, but generally the written testimony is meager. Without resorting to archaeological and ethnographic data, we would know next to nothing about the Pecheneg crafts. As noted by Schmitt, Skylitzes only indirectly refers to blacksmithing among them; for reports on the making of clothes we must look to Ammianus Marcellinus or Priscus of Panium; Eastern sources briefly inform us about the role of trade in Pecheneg life.<sup>231</sup> The same can be said about socio-political organization – Constantine Porphyrogenitus offers more information on the subject than the 11th-century authors.<sup>232</sup>

Oliver Jens Schmitt of Martin Luther University, Halle-Wittenberg, having already written on such issues as the role of nomads in supplying Constantinople with meat<sup>233</sup> and the waging of war by tribal societies,<sup>234</sup> turned to the invasion (or full-scale migration) of the Pechenegs across the Danube triggered by the conflict between Kegen and Tyrach. Unlike Shepard and Stephenson, Schmitt does not rely solely on written sources; he endeavors to understand the Pecheneg social organization and the causes of Pecheneg migrations. He correctly defines nomadic pastoralism as the economic basis of Pecheneg society.<sup>235</sup> That is why Schmitt argues that famine, rather than epidemic disease, as reported by Attaleiates and Skylitzes, was the principal cause of the death of many of Tyrach’s Pechenegs in the winter of 1046/47.<sup>236</sup>

230 Florin Curta, *Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages (500–1300)*, 1, 169.

231 Oliver J. Schmitt, “Die Petschenegen auf dem Balkan von 1046 bis 1072,” 475.

232 Ibid., 476.

233 Idem, “Zur Fleischversorgung Konstantinopels,” *JÖB* 54 (2004), 145.

234 Idem, “Kriegsführung und tribale Gesellschaft,” in *Krieg – Gesellschaft – Institutionen*, eds. Burkhard Meißner et al. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2005), 417–44.

235 On the role of raiding and plunder in the Pechenegs’ economic life see: Schmitt, “Die Petschenegen auf dem Balkan von 1046 bis 1072,” 484.

236 Ibid., 479. Schmitt estimates the number of Tyrach’s Pechenegs at 20,000, as opposed to 800,000 as reported by Skylitzes or 100,000 as argued by Ferluga. In Schmitt’s view, not all Pechenegs north of the Black Sea were under Tyrach’s authority. This is evidenced by the simultaneous attacks in 1036 on both Rus’ and Byzantium and by some Pecheneg groups’ pushing forward into Hungary: Ibid. Schmitt similarly doubts that 15,000 Pechenegs under the command of Soultzou, Selte, Karaman, and Kataleim were sent to Asia Minor. He believes each of these officers commanded a *tagma* of horsemen (around 400–500 men): Ibid., 481. See also: Meško, “K veľkosti pečenežských zoskupení (hôrď) na Balkáne v druhej polovici 11. storočia.”

Schmitt also questions the credibility of the Byzantine authors' testimony regarding the nomads' transition to farming, but believes it possible that they may have switched from nomadic pastoralism to transhumance.<sup>237</sup> He concludes that the crossing of the Danube by the Pechenegs in the winter of 1046/47 was not a military operation but a forced migration (*Fluchtbewegung*), triggered by pressure from the Uzes and Rus'. The Pecheneg attacks on Byzantine settlements in 1048 were caused by dissatisfaction on the part of both the Pecheneg elites and commoners with the conditions on which the empire had admitted them.<sup>238</sup>

#### 4 Selected Problems in the History of Byzantium's Relations with Steppe Dwellers and Attempts to Solve Them

Nomadic studies face numerous challenges. The fragmentary nature of the written testimony on the Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans in the North Pontic steppes and the Balkan-Danubian region is just one of the difficulties scholars must deal with. Byzantine authors' treatment of nomads is commonly anachronistic and stereotypical, and their reports, in any case, often contradict each other. The archaeological evidence is impossible to interpret definitively; furthermore, it continues to be destroyed on a vast scale due to extensive industrial and agricultural development, activities of illegal archaeologists, natural phenomena, and negligence in the preservation of archaeological collections, especially in the countries of the former USSR. Owing to all of these factors, many facets of nomadic history run the risk of never coming to light. In these circumstances, all historians can hope to do is create a picture of the past that would be as consistent as possible with the available sources.

For instance, Constantin Zuckerman of the *École Pratique des Hautes Études* (Paris) has drawn up a model of the history of the region north of the Black Sea in the 9th century.<sup>239</sup> Peter Golden, taking as his starting point Ioannes Skylitzes' statement that the Khazars asked for Byzantium's help in the construction of the fortress of Sarkel to fend off Pecheneg attacks,<sup>240</sup> concludes that the Pechenegs were present in the North Pontic steppes as early as the

237 "Vom horizontalen zum vertikalen Nomadismus": *Ibid.*, 480.

238 *Ibid.*, 487–8.

239 Zuckerman, "Les Hongrois au pays de Lebedia: Une nouvelle puissance aux confins de Byzance et de la Khazarie ca 836–889." In Russian: *Idem*, "Vengry v strane Levedii: novaya derzhava na granitsakh Vizantii i Khazarii ok. 836–889 g.," *MAIET* 6 (1998), 663–88.

240 *Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsis historiarum*, 73; John Skylitzes, *A Synopsis of Byzantine History, 811–1057*, 74.

first third of the 9th century.<sup>241</sup> Zuckerman, on the other hand, argues that the main threat to the Khazars in the area of Sarkel came from the Hungarian tribes, rather than the Pechenegs, who appeared in the region only at the end of the century. Zuckerman attempts (once again!) to locate Levedia (between the Don and Southern Buh) and Atelkuz (between the Dnieper and Siret) and to date the presence of the Hungarian tribes there (836–889 and 889–895, respectively).<sup>242</sup> According to Zuckerman, in 873 the Hungarians pushed the Khazars out of Crimea.<sup>243</sup> His take on the relations between the Magyars and Khazars, Magyars and Byzantines, and Pechenegs and Khazars in the 9th century also deserves notice.

James Howard-Johnston of Oxford University questions the accepted chronology of the Bulgaro-Byzantine war and proposes an earlier one. He suggests that the Khazars played an important part in the Pechenegs' aggressive actions against the Magyars. According to him, the Magyars ceased to fulfill the role of a counterweight against Rus', which they had been playing for the Khazar Khaganate, and thus the latter may have induced the Pechenegs to war against them at the end of the 9th century.<sup>244</sup> Howard-Johnston represents the Khazars as reformers of the Pecheneg social organization.<sup>245</sup>

Howard-Johnston has also published his views on the *DAI*: he argues that this work is in large part made up of four diplomatic dossiers prepared between the years 900 and 910 for or by Leo VI as supplements to his military treatise.<sup>246</sup> He emphasises the Byzantines' extensive knowledge of the Pecheneg affairs, much greater than that of Arab or Western authors.<sup>247</sup>

241 Peter B. Golden, "The Migrations of the Oğuz," *Archivum Ottomanicum* 4 (1972), 62–3. See also: Imre Boba, *Nomads, Northmen and Slavs. Eastern Europe in the Ninth Century* (The Hague/Wiesbaden: Mouton/Otto Harrassowitz, 1967), 70–4.

242 Zuckerman, "Vengry v strane Levedii," 665–9. For another attempt to describe the peoples of the northern Black Sea steppes and pin down the locations of the historic regions mentioned in the *DAI*, see: George Huxley, "Steppe-Peoples in Konstantinos Porphyrogenetos," *JÖB* 34 (1984), 77–89. See also: Yaroslav V. Pylypchuk, "Etnogenez i migratsii pechenegov," *AEMAE* 23 (2017), 207–56.

243 Zuckerman, "Vengry v strane Levedii," 677.

244 James Howard-Johnston, "Byzantium, Bulgaria and the Peoples of Ukraine in the 890s," *MAIET* 7 (2000), 342–56.

245 Idem, "Byzantine Sources for Khazar History," in *The World of the Khazars*, 188–9.

246 Idem, "The 'De Administrando Imperio': A Re-examination of the Text and a Re-evaluation of Its Evidence about the Rus," in *Les Centres proto-urbains russes entre Scandinavie, Byzance et Orient*, ed. Michel Kazanski (Paris: P. Lethielleux, 2000), 301–6.

247 Idem, "Byzantine Sources for Khazar History," 185–6.

The silence of the Byzantine sources on the Pechenegs during the period from the Battle of Acheloos<sup>248</sup> and until the start of Sviatoslav's Balkan campaigns<sup>249</sup> perhaps argues in favor of Howard-Johnston's idea that information about the Pechenegs collected during the reign of Leo VI was used in compiling the *DAI*. Byzantine texts make no mention of Pecheneg involvement in the invasion of 934 (the so-called battle of W.l.n.d.r)<sup>250</sup> or in the campaigns of Prince Igor',<sup>251</sup> which ended with the signing of the known treaty.<sup>252</sup>

- 
- 248 Steven Runciman, *The Emperor Romanus Lecapenus and His Reign* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1963), 53–5.
- 249 The exceptions are a letter from Nicholas Mystikos to Tsar Simeon, dating from 922, and the works of Constantine Porphyrogenitus: Shepard, "Symeon's Confrontation with Byzantium c. 917: Diplomatic Ripples across Eurasia," 13; Constantin Zuckerman, "The Khazars' Formal Adoption of Judaism and Byzantium's Northern Policy," 29.
- 250 Al-Mas'ūdī, *Bis zu den Grenzen der Erde: Auszüge aus dem "Buch der Goldwäschen"*, ed. and transl. Gernot Rotter (Tübingen/Basel: Horst Erdmann, 1978), 103–6; "Maszúdi," in *A magyarok elődeiről és a honfoglalásról. Kortársak és krónikások híradásai*, ed. György Györffy (Budapest: Osiris, 2002), 98–101. Symeon the Metaphrast speaks only of the Hungarians (Τούρκοι): "Symeonis Magistri Annales," in *Theophanes Continuatus, Ioannes Cameniata, Symeon Magister, Georgius Monachus*, ed. Immanuel Bekker (*CSHB*, 45) (Bonn: E. Weber, 1838), 746; Oikonomidès, "Vardariotes – W.l.n.d.r – v.n.nd.r." The events of 934 still remain a historiographical blank spot. For instance, Joachim Henning notes that during the excavations at Pliska rhomboid arrowheads were found in the 10th-century layers, which could potentially be linked to the Pechenegs, among others; but since the Pechenegs crossed the Danube only after the year 1000, these arrowheads most likely are Magyar: Joachim Henning, "Pliska and Continental Europe in the Later 9th to 10th C. AD: Invasions, State Formation and Stronghold Building," in *Proceedings of the 22nd International Congress of Byzantine Studies, Sofia 22–27 August 2011*, vol. 2, *Abstracts of Round Table Communications* (Sofia: Bulgarian Historical Heritage Foundation, 2011), 251–2.
- 251 *The Russian Primary Chronicle. Laurentian text*, ed. and transl. Samuel H. Cross and Olgerd P. Sherbowitz-Wetzor (Cambridge, Mass.: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1953), 72–3.
- 252 See: Alexei S. Shchavelev, "Datirovka dogovora knyazyia Igorya Ryurikovicha Starogo s imperatorom Romanom I Lakapinom: khronologicheskiye oriyentiry," in *Spetsial'nyye istoricheskiye distsipliny*, 2, ed. Boris L. Fonkich (Moscow: Institut vseobshchey istorii RAN, 2018), 304–19. Zuckerman proposes a different version of these events. He argues that the failed invasion of Byzantium was actually led by Prince Oleg, who lost power after the defeat and decided to launch a raid on Bardha'a (Azerbaijan), where he perished. Thus, in Zuckerman's view, Oleg ruled Rus' in 911–941, and Igor' – in 941–45; Zuckerman, "On the Date of the Khazars' Conversion to Judaism and the Chronology of the Kings of the Rus Oleg and Igor. A Study of the Anonymous Khazar Letter from the Genizah of Cairo," *RÉB* 53 (1995), 237–70; Idem, "Rus', Vizantiya i Khazariya v seredine X v.: problema khronologii," in *Slavyane i ikh sosedi. Grecheskiy i slavyanskiy mir v sredniye veka i ranneye novoye vremya*, eds. Gennadii G. Litavrin et al. (Moscow: Indrik, 1996), 68–80.



This treaty was considered by George Vernadsky<sup>253</sup> and Frank E. Wozniak.<sup>254</sup> Vernadsky (1887–1973) theorized that Rus' grew out of a multi-ethnic (i.e. Alano-Slavic-Norman) khaganate that emerged in the Azov region and then extended its power to the rest of the territory of Rus'.<sup>255</sup> He believed that under the treaty of 945 the Rus' prince (not Igor', but an unknown lord of Tamatarcha) undertook to protect Crimea from the Black Bulgars and Khazars and to assist the emperor in gaining control of those cities that were still outside the Byzantine rule.<sup>256</sup> Wozniak also drew attention to the Black Bulgars, who, in his view, during this period inhabited the area between the Don and Dnieper and threatened Byzantium's Crimean possessions. During the 10th century, the empire tried to adhere to a policy of balance between Rus' and the Pechenegs in order to maintain equilibrium in the region.<sup>257</sup>

There is a large body of literature on the Bulgarian campaigns of Sviatoslav.<sup>258</sup> However, not much attention has been given to the part played by the Pechenegs in these ventures. The Polish historian Andrzej Poppe (1926–2019), a specialist in the ecclesiastical history of Rus', believes Constantinople was behind the murder of Sviatoslav by the Pechenegs.<sup>259</sup> His opinion is opposed by another Polish historian, Aleksander Paroń of the Institute of Archaeology

253 George Vernadsky, "The Rus' in the Crimea and the Russo-Byzantine Treaty of 945," *Byzantina-Metabyzantina: A Journal of Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 1 (1946), no. 1, 249–60.

254 Frank E. Wozniak, "The Crimean Question, the Black Bulgarians, and the Russo-Byzantine Treaty of 944," *Journal of Medieval History* 5 (1979), no. 2, 115–26; Idem, "Byzantium, the Pechenegs and the Rus': The Limitations of a Great Power's Influence on Its Clients in the 10th Century Eurasian Steppe," *AEMAE* 4 (1984), 299–316. See also his "Byzantine Policy on the Black Sea or Russian Steppe in the Late 830's," *Byzantine Studies/Études byzantines* 2 (1975), 56–62.

255 See: Andrei Yu. Dvornichenko, "Vizantiysko-russko-krymskiye motivy v tvorchestve Georgiya Vernadskogo," *Klio* 116 (2016), no. 8 (116), 100.

256 Vernadsky, "The Rus' in the Crimea and the Russo-Byzantine Treaty of 945," 249–59.

257 Idem, "Byzantium, the Pechenegs and the Rus': The Limitations of a Great Power's Influence on Its Clients in the 10th Century Eurasian Steppe," 301.

258 See, for instance, Antony D. Stokes, "The Background and Chronology of the Balkan Campaigns of Svyatoslav Igorevich," *SEER* 40 (1961), no. 94, 44–57; Idem, "The Balkan Campaigns of Svyatoslav Igorevich," *SEER* 40 (1962), no. 95, 466–96; Walter K. Hanak, "The Infamous Svyatoslav: Master of Duplicity in War and Peace?" in *Peace and War in Byzantium: Essays in Honor of George T. Dennis, S.J.*, eds. Timothy S. Miller and John Nesbitt (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1995), 138–51; Franklin and Shepard, *The Emergence of Rus 750–1200*, 139–50; Warren Treadgold, *A History of the Byzantine State and Society* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997), 501–4, 508–9.

259 Andrzej Poppe, "The Political Background to the Baptism of Rus'," *DOP* 30 (1976), 221.

and Ethnology of the Polish Academy of Sciences.<sup>260</sup> The Pechenegs killed Sviatoslav on their own initiative, believes Paroń, as revenge for the failed Balkan campaign and the prince's separate peace with the empire. Byzantium, on the other hand, was interested in renewing good neighborly relations with Rus', established during Princess Olga's reign. In a paper presented at the 22nd International Congress of Byzantine Studies in Sofia, Paroń observes that different Byzantine emperors favored different policies towards the Pechenegs. After no help was received from the nomads in the Battle of Acheloos, for the next two decades we find no mention of any attempts by the empire to establish cooperation with them. Only invasions by the Magyars (934) and the Rus' (944) again forced Constantinople to turn to the Pechenegs, and Constantine Porphyrogenitus formed an alliance with them,<sup>261</sup> which, however, was no longer in evidence during the reign of Nikephoros Phokas. Equally limited was the influence exerted on the Pechenegs by Ioannes Tzimiskes: Theophilos, a representative of the emperor, proved unable to prevent the murder of Sviatoslav. Tzimiskes thus tried to find allies more stable than the steppe nomads.<sup>262</sup>

Aleksander Paroń has also addressed the problem of the image of the Pechenegs and other nomads in Byzantine and Western historiography,<sup>263</sup> written about the religious mission of Bishop Bruno of Querfurt to the

260 Aleksander Paroń, "Uchastiye vizantiyskoy diplomatii v ubiystve knyazya Svyatoslava Igorevicha," *Stratum Plus* (2005–2009), no. 5, 494–9.

261 Paroń treats the issue of the *DAI* as a source separately: Idem, "Trzeba abyś tymi oto słowami odparł i to niedorzeczne żądanie' – wokół *De administrando imperio* Konstantyna VII Porfirogenety," in *Causa creandi. O pragmatyce źródła historycznego*, eds. by Stanisław Rosik and Przemysław Wiszewski (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 2005), 345–63; Idem, "Pieczyngowie na kartach *De administrando imperio* Konstantyna VII Porfirogenety," *Classica Wratislaviensia* 27 (2007), 97–112.

262 Alexander Paroń, "Byzantium and Pechenegs in the 10th Century. An Attempt at Rethinking Their Political Relations," in *Proceedings of the 22nd International Congress of Byzantine Studies, Sofia, 22–27 August 2011*, vol. 3, *Abstracts of Free Communications*, eds. Angel Nikolov et al. (Sofia: Bulgarian Historical Heritage Foundation, 2011), 231–2.

263 Alexander Paroń, "Scytowie w historiografii bizantyjskiej – między naturą a kulturą," in *Mundus hominis – cywilizacja, natura, kultura*, ed. Stanisław Rosik and Przemysław Wiszewski (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 2006), 447–56; Alexander Paroń, "Dzicy, odrażający, źli (?) – wizerunek nomadów w historiografii bizantyjskiej i łacińskiej z 2. połowy X-początku XIII w.," in *Populi terrae marisque. Prace poświęcone pamięci prof. Lecha Leciejewicza*, eds. Marian Rębkowski and Stanisław Rosik (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Chronicon, 2011), 123–137; Alexander Paroń, "The Image of Nomads of the Black Sea Steppes in the Byzantine Historiography of the 10th–12th Centuries. Perceiving of the 'Other' and Political Practice," *Pontica* 47 (2014), 111–21; Idem, "The Greed of the Nomads. Literary Topes and Reality," *International Journal of Eurasian Studies* 2 (2015), 64–79.

Pechenegs,<sup>264</sup> and published a monograph on the Pechenegs, in which he dwelled in detail on their relations with Byzantium.<sup>265</sup> The scholar has great interest in nomadic social organization.<sup>266</sup> In a historiographical essay on the current state of nomadic studies in Poland, he observes with regret that their peak fell on the 1970s and 1980s,<sup>267</sup> while in recent years the nomads have

- 264 Paroń disputes the idea, widespread in Polish historiography, that the mission of Bruno of Querfurt to the Pechenegs was part of Bolesław the Brave's political plans: Alexander Paroń, "Brunona z Kwerfurtu wyprawa do Pieczyngów – aspekty misyjne i polityczne," *Slavia Antiqua* 54 (2013), 97–116; Idem, "Facta est christiana lex, in pessimo et crudelissimo populo: Bruno of Querfurt among the Pechenegs," in *The Steppe Lands and the World Beyond Them*, 161–78. The Polish historian Karol Kollinger has also written on Bishop Bruno's mission: Karol Kollinger, "St. Bruno of Querfurt and his account of a mission to the Pechenegs," in *Conversions. Looking for Ideological Change in the Early Middle Ages*, eds. Leszek P. Słupecki and Rudolf Simek (Vienna: Fassbaender, 2013), 187–202.
- 265 Alexander Paroń, *Pieczyngowie. Koczownicy w krajobrazie politycznym i kulturowym średniowiecznej Europy* (Wrocław: Instytut Archeologii i Etnologii Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 2015), 366–422. English version: Idem, *The Pechenegs: Nomads in the Political and Cultural Landscape of Medieval Europe* (ECEE, 74) (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2021).
- 266 Idem, "Wczesne państwa nomadów w Europie wczesnego średniowiecza (do 1000 roku). Modele i prawidłowości rozwoju," in *Instytucja "wczesnego państwa" w perspektywie wielości i różnorodności kultur*, eds. Jacek Banaszkiewicz et al. (Poznań: Instytut Archeologii i Etnologii PAN, 2013), 221–48; Idem, "Consensus Through Violence? Some Remarks on the Relations between the Nomadic Societies of the Medieval Eurasia and the Outside World," *Consensus or Violence? Cohesive Forces in Early and High Medieval Societies (9th–14th C.)*, eds. Sławomir Moździoch and Przemysław Wiszewski (Wrocław: Institute of History at the University of Wrocław, 2013), 271–84; Alexander Paroń, "The Nomadic State of Early Medieval Europe on the Background of the Eurasian Steppes' Political Structures. An Essay," in *Potestas et communitas. Interdisziplinäre Beiträge zu Wesen und Darstellung von Herrschaftsverhältnissen im Mittelalter östlich der Elbe/Interdisciplinary Studies of the Constitution and Demonstration of Power Relations in the Middle Ages East of the Elbe*, eds. Alexander Paroń et al. (Wrocław/Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Archeologii i Etnologii PAN, 2010), 163–80.
- 267 Aleksander Paroń's skepticism notwithstanding, the contribution of Polish historians, archaeologists, and Orientalists to the study of the history of the medieval nomads has been quite significant. For a general overview of the progress made in the last third of the 20th century, see: Jan Tyszkiewicz, "Koczownicy Europy średniowiecznej w polskich badaniach końca XX wieku," in *Pytania o średniowiecze. Potrzeby i perspektywy badawcze polskiej mediewistyki*, ed. Wojciech Fałkowski (Warsaw: Neriton, 2001), 237–54. The works of the archaeologist Witold Świętosławski, who studied nomadic weaponry and traces of the presence of 10th- to 13th-century nomads in the lands of modern Poland, deserve special mention: Witold Świętosławski, *Uzbrojenie koczowników Wielkiego Stepu w czasach ekspansji Mongołów. XII–XIV w.* (Łódź: Łódzkie Towarzystwo Naukowe, 1996); [an English version] Idem, *Arms and Armour of the Nomads of the Great Steppe in the Times of the Mongol Expansion (12th–14th Centuries)* (Łódź: Oficyna Naukowa, 1999); Idem, *Archeologiczne ślady najazdów tatarskich na Europę Środkową w XIII w.* (Łódź: PAN, 1997);

been losing their appeal for Polish historians, who are increasingly turning to Scandinavian themes (compare this with the rejection of the *Steppenfixierung* in Hungarian historiography). As one reason for this, Paroń sees the fall of the Iron Curtain in 1989 and Poland's desire to merge into the family of European nations.<sup>268</sup> In Europe, nomads disappeared as a phenomenon and, according to some Polish researchers, they were mostly a brake on the development of civilization anyway. In contrast to this attitude, Paroń cites the work of the archaeologist and historian Lech Leciejewicz, who represents the steppe world as one of the "cultural rings" of medieval Europe.<sup>269</sup>

Pecheneg-Byzantine relations are dealt with in the works of Jacek Bonarek and Jarosław Dudek. Bonarek defended a doctoral dissertation on the image of foreigners in the *Chronicle* of Ioannes Skylitzes.<sup>270</sup> He has also written on Sviatoslav's Balkan campaigns,<sup>271</sup> and published a book on the condition of Byzantium in the era of the Battle of Manzikert, with an entire chapter on the Pechenegs.<sup>272</sup> Particularly noteworthy is his take on the formation of a new identities in the Balkans in the 11th century.<sup>273</sup> Jarosław Dudek has authored a monograph on the Khazars,<sup>274</sup> and tackled the issues of the reconstruction of the missionary route of Bishop Bruno of Querfurt to the Pechenegs and the

---

Idem, *Ślady koczowników Wielkiego Stepu z X, XI i XII wieku w dorzeczu Wisły i Odry* (Łódź: Instytut Archeologii i Etnologii PAN, 2006).

- 268 Idem, "Nomades des Grandes Steppes dans les Études Polonaises Médiévales. La fin de la tradition de recherches?" *Archéologie. Annales de l'Académie Polonaise des Sciences, Centres Scientifique à Paris* 8, (2013), 177–8.
- 269 Lech Leciejewicz, *Nowa postać świata. Narodziny średniowiecznej cywilizacji europejskiej* (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 2000).
- 270 Jacek Bonarek, *Romajowie i obcy w Bizancjum. Obraz europejskich grup etnicznych w "Kronice" Jana Skylitzesa* (Toruń: Adam Marszałek, 2003).
- 271 Idem, "Przyczyny i cele bułgarskich wypraw Świętosława a polityka Bizancjum w latach sześćdziesiątych X wieku," *Studia Historyczne* 39 (1996), no. 3, 288–302.
- 272 Idem, *Bizancjum w dobie bitwy pod Mantzikert. Znaczenie zagrożenia seldżuckiego w polityce bizantyńskiej w XI wieku* (Cracow: Historia Iagellonica, 2011), 71–94.
- 273 Idem, "Le Bas Danube dans la seconde moitié du XIème siècle: nouveaux États ou nouveaux peuples?"
- 274 Idem, *Chazarowie. Polityka, kultura, religia. VII–XI wiek* (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 2016).

activities of Pseudo-Diogenes.<sup>275</sup> In 2005, he published a contextological analysis of the seal of Kegen.<sup>276</sup>

Polish academic interest in medieval Byzantine-nomadic relations<sup>277</sup> may be explained by the existence of a long tradition of Byzantine and Oriental studies in Poland and the availability of Polish translations of the works of Anna Komnene (1969, 1972), Nikephoros Bryennios (1974), and Michael Psellos (1985), made by Oktawiusz Jurewicz (1926–2016), as well as the notable presence of the Pechenegs, Cumans, and Tatars in the medieval history of Poland.

Sergei Ivanov, Gerald Mako, and László Balogh have each addressed the problem of the Christianization of the Pechenegs.<sup>278</sup> Ivanov endeavors to refute the common belief that Byzantium strove to convert its neighbors to Christianity at any cost. In his view, Christianization played only a minor role in Constantinople's foreign policy. As for nomads, sedentarization was a prerequisite for their baptism.<sup>279</sup> Gerald Mako argues that "despite settling in a predominantly Christian region, the Pechenegs of Northern Bulgaria long maintained their traditional beliefs and customs," and "the Byzantines were by no means interested in proselytizing widely among the Pechenegs."<sup>280</sup> Balogh

275 Idem, "List Brunona z Kwerfurtu do Henryka II i De administrando imperio (cap. 37) Konstantyna Porfirogenety: próba rekonstrukcji trasy misyjnej Brunona do kraju Pieczyngów," in *Brun z Kwerfurtu. Osoba – dzieło – epoka*, eds. Marian Dygo and Wojciech Fałkowski (Pułtusk: Akademia Humanistyczna imienia Aleksandra Gieysztor, 2010), 241–54; Idem, "Diogenowicze na ziemi połowieckiej i ruskiej w XI–XII," in *"Młodsza Europa": od średniowiecza do współczesności. Prace ofiarowane profesor Marii Barbarze Piechowiak Topolskiej w siedemdziesiątą rocznicę urodzin*, eds. Jan Jurkiewicz et al. (Zielona Góra: Uniwersytet Zielonogórski, 2008), 63–81.

276 Interestingly, Dudek sees the fact that Kegen's celestial patron was Ioannes Prodromos as an indication that Kegen was the first Pecheneg ruler to enter Byzantine service, and also concludes that the name Πατριρχία on the seal denotes the area of Serdica-Nish-Ovče Pole: Dudek, "Pieczęć magistra Jana Kegeny jako wyraz polityki Bizancjum wobec stepowców w połowie XI w."

277 See also: Eugeniusz Kucharski and Marian Lewicki, "Rzesza pieczyńska a stosunki polsko-ruskie w X i XI wieku," in *Księga Referatów II Międzynarodowego Zjazdu Słowistów (Filologów słowiańskich) w Warszawie, sekcja III–IV Kulturno-Społeczna* (Warsaw: Drukarnia Bankowa, 1934), 44–8.

278 Gerald Mako, *Two Examples of Nomadic Conversion in Eastern Europe: The Christianization of the Pechenegs, and the Islamization of the Volga Bulgars (Tenth to Thirteenth Century AD)* [MA thesis] (Cambridge, UK, 2011); Ivanov, *Vizantijskoye missionerstvo*, 226–30, 240; Balogh, "A besenyők hitvilága és a világvallások."

279 Ivanov, *Vizantijskoye missionerstvo*, 336.

280 Mako, *Two Examples of Nomadic Conversion in Eastern Europe*, 39 and 44.

suggests that Tsar Simeon's marriage offers to Pecheneg rulers could mean that at least a percentage of the Pecheneg elite were familiar with Christianity.<sup>281</sup>

Military history traditionally enjoys great popularity among historians. The Dutch medievalist Krijnie Ciggaar devoted several works to the subject of Flemish, Varangian, and English mercenaries in Byzantine service. Harald Hardrada participated in repelling the Pecheneg invasion of the Balkans in 1036;<sup>282</sup> a Flemish cavalry unit fought in the Battle of Leboundion;<sup>283</sup> and fugitives from the British Isles participated in the Byzantine campaigns against the Pechenegs during the period from the reign of Michael VII to that of Alexios Komnenos.<sup>284</sup> Peter Frankopan published a brief essay on the dating of the expedition against the Pechenegs omitted from the *Alexiad* but mentioned in the *Typikon* of Gregorios Pakourianos. In his view, it took place in late 1082–83.<sup>285</sup> Michael Angold believes that the settling of the Pechenegs in the Balkans was the main cause of the rebellion of the western armies in 1047 under Leo Tornikios.<sup>286</sup> Norman Tobias offers a detailed analysis of the Battle of Kalavrye (1078) between Alexios Komnenos and the rebel Nikephoros Bryennios, with Pecheneg participation.<sup>287</sup> Jean-Claude Cheynet, Mark Bartusis, Paul Magdalino, Alexandru Madgearu, Yusuf Ayönü, and a number

281 Balogh, "A besenyők hitvilága és a világvallások," 97.

282 This conclusion was made on the basis of the testimony of the *Morkinskinna* and the *History of the Archbishops of Hamburg and Bremen*: Krijnie N. Ciggaar, "Harald Hardrada: His Expedition Against the Pechenegs," *Balkan Studies* 21 (1980), 385–401. The Swedish archaeologist Bertil Almgren (1918–2011) believed that the Vikings adopted cavalry from the Pechenegs and Magyars; the most likely place where they could interact with representatives of these peoples was in Byzantine service: Bertil Almgren, *The Viking* (New York: Crescent Books, 1975), 228–31.

283 Such is her interpretation of the episode from the *Hákonar saga Herðibreiðs* that has been a subject of some debate: Krijnie N. Ciggaar, "Flemish Mercenaries in Byzantium: Their Later History in an Old Norse Miracle." See also: Jonathan Shepard, "Another New England? Anglo-Saxon Settlement on the Black Sea," *Byzantine Studies* 1 (1974), no. 1, 18–39.

284 Krijnie Ciggaar, "L'émigration anglaise à Byzance après 1066. Un nouveau texte en latin sur les Varangues à Constantinople," *RÉB* 32 (1974), 301–42. On the service of foreign mercenaries in the Byzantine army, see also: Jonathan Shepard, "The Uses of the Franks in Eleventh-Century Byzantium," *Anglo-Norman Studies* 15 (1993), 275–305; Paul Magdalino, "The Byzantine Army and the Land: from Stratotikon Ktēma to Military Pronoia," in *To empólemo Vyzántio (908-1208 ai.)*, 27–9.

285 Peter Frankopan, "A Victory of Gregory Pakourianos Against the Pechenegs," *BS* 57 (1996), no. 2, 280.

286 Michael Angold, "The Byzantine State on the Eve of the Battle of Manzikert," *BF* 16 (1991), 17.

287 Norman Tobias, "The Tactics and Strategy of Alexius Comnenus at Calavrytae, 1078," *Byzantine Studies/Etudes byzantines* 6 (1979), no. 1–2, 193–211.

of other historians have written about Pechenegs and Uzes in the Byzantine army.<sup>288</sup>

One of the goals of Vasilii Vasilievskii's "Byzantium and the Pechenegs" was to show that there was a close relationship between the genesis of the First Crusade and events in Byzantium involving the Danubian nomads. As Peter Charanis notes, "it is generally admitted also that Alexius appealed to the pope for help in order to face the Patzinak danger during the terrible winter of 1090–91."<sup>289</sup>

Interest in the Crusades began to grow with the start of the Cold War. Western countries came to be seen as heirs to the Crusaders, and the Soviet Union and its satellites – as objects of the Crusaders' activities.<sup>290</sup> Soviet scholars in particular began to focus specifically on the Fourth Crusade, viewing the earlier ones as a prelude to the capture of Constantinople and overthrow of the Eastern Roman Empire by forces of the West.<sup>291</sup> A number of important articles<sup>292</sup> and monumental studies<sup>293</sup> on the history of the Crusades appeared in the first post-war decade. Various aspects of this subject were actively

288 Jean-Claude Cheynet, "Les effectifs de l'armée byzantine aux Xe-XIIe siècles," *Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale* 38–152 (1995), 319–35; Mark Bartusis, *The Late Byzantine Army: Arms and Society, 1204–1453* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992), 257–8, 330; Madgearu, "The Pechenegs in the Byzantine Army"; Ayönü, "Bizans Ordusunda Ücretli Türk Askerler (XI–XII. Yüzyillar)." The military aspect of Byzantine-nomadic relations has been closely considered by Hans Kühn, John W. Birkenmeier, Athina Kolia-Dermitzaki, and Marek Meško (see above): Hans Kühn, *Die Byzantinische Armee im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert. Studien zur Organisation der Tagmata* (Vienna: Fassbaender Verlag, 1991); John W. Birkenmeier, *The Development of the Komnenian Army: 1081–1180* (History of Warfare, 5) (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 44–55; Athina Kolia-Dermitzaki, "To empólemo Vyzántio stis omilíes kai tis epistolés tou 1000 kai 1100 ai. Mia ideologikí proséngisi," in *To empólemo Vyzántio (90s-120s ai.)*, 213–38.

289 Peter Charanis, "Byzantium, the West and the Origin of the First Crusade," *Byzantion* 19 (1949), 24.

290 Mikhail A. Zaborov, "Sovremennaya burzhuaznaya istoriografiya krestovyykh pokhodov – orudiye propagandy zakhvatnicheskikh voyn," *Sredniye veka* 4 (1953), 307.

291 This was noted even by "socialist" Polish historians: Tadeusz Roslanowski, "Przegląd nowszych badań nad historią wypraw krzyżowych," *Kwartalnik Historyczny* (1958), no. 4, 131–35.

292 Charanis, "Byzantium, the West and the Origin of the First Crusade"; Steven Runciman, "The First Crusader's Journey across the Balcan Peninsula," *Byzantion* 19 (1949), 208–21; Paul Lemerle, "Byzance et la Croisade," in *Relazioni del X Congresso Internazionale di Scienze Storiche. 3. Storia del Medioevo* (Firenze: G.C. Sansoni, 1955), 595–620.

293 Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, 3 vols (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1951–1954); *A History of the Crusades*, vol. 1, *The First Hundred Years*, gen. ed. Kenneth M. Setton, ed. Marshall W. Baldwin (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1955).

discussed during the 10th International Congress of Historians, held in 1955 in Rome.<sup>294</sup>

Paul Magdalino points out that, in the second half of the 20th century, the Western historiography of the First Crusade moved away from the tradition of the synthetic view of its subject (from the point of view of both the Crusaders and Constantinople): while Steven Runciman emphasized the important role of Alexios Komnenos in the launching of the First Crusade and in its progress, in the writings of Jonathan Riley-Smith and his school “Byzantium is barely mentioned.”<sup>295</sup> The role of the trans-Danubian nomads in the genesis of the First Crusade also came to be perceived as less prominent, and the idea became more widespread that the Byzantine emperor was drumming up troops in the West for the purpose of reconquering Asia Minor, rather than overcoming the Pecheneg and Cuman threat.<sup>296</sup>

However, Jonathan Shepard and Peter Frankopan continued to stress the great part played by the incursions of the trans-Danubian nomads in Alexios Komnenos’ forced decision to seek help from the West, which directly or indirectly led to the First Crusade. Shepard believed that the arrival of Western mercenaries was supposed to protect the Byzantine emperor from surprises

294 Lemerle, “Byzance et la Croisade”; Michail A. Zaborov, “Istoriya krestovyykh pokhodov v ‘Dokladakh’ X Mezhdunarodnogo kongressa istorikov v Rime,” *Sredniye veka* 8 (1956), 396–404; Roslanowski, “Przegląd nowszych badań nad historią wypraw krzyżowych.”

295 Paul Magdalino, *The Byzantine Background to the First Crusade* (Toronto: Department of Languages and Literature, University of Guelph, 1996), 4–5. Problems of the genesis of the First Crusade have also been dealt with in the work of Peter Charanis (1908–85), François-Louis Ganshof (1895–1980), Herbert E.J. Cowdrey (1926–2009), Susan Edgington, Athina Kolia-Dermizaki, Franziska Shlosser, Jonathan Shepard, and other historians: Charanis, “Byzantium, the West and the Origin of the First Crusade”; François-Louis Ganshof, “Rober le Frison et Alexis Comnène,” *Byzantion* 31 (1961), 57–74; Herbert E.J. Cowdrey, “The Gregorain Papacy, Byzantium and the First Crusade,” *BF* 13 (1988), 145–69; Susan Edgington, “The First Crusade: Reweiving the Evidence,” in *The First Crusade: Origin and Impact*, ed. Jonathan Phillips (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997), 57–77; Athina Kolia-Dermizaki, “Die Kreuzfahrer und die Kreuzzüge im Sprachengebrauch der Byzantiner,” *JÖB* 41 (1991), 163–88; Eadem, “Byzantium and the Crusades in the Komnenian era. Perception and Reality,” in *Byzantium and the West. Perception and Reality (11th–15th c.)*, eds. Nikolaos Chrissis et al. (London: Routledge, 2019), 59–83; Franziska Shlosser, “Byzantine Studies and the History of the Crusades: The ‘Alexiad’ of Anna Comnena as Source for the Crusades,” *BF* 15 (1990), 397–406; Jonathan Shepard, “Cross-purposes: Alexius Comnenus and the First Crusade,” in *The First Crusade: Origin and Impact*, 107–29.

296 Carole Hillenbrand, *The Crusades: Islamic Perspectives* (New York: Routledge, 2000), 19–20.



that an alliance with the Cumans could be fraught with;<sup>297</sup> he noted that at the end of the 11th century the nomads already knew how to use the empire's internal troubles to their advantage.<sup>298</sup> Frankopan saw the hostile activities of the Pechenegs as one of the main causes of the weakening of the empire's international position, which resulted in, among other things, the granting of substantial trading privileges to the Venetians.<sup>299</sup> The two main dangers that compelled the Byzantine emperor to turn to the West came from the Pechenegs and the Seljuk Turks.<sup>300</sup>

Given that the chroniclers of the First Crusade, such as the anonymous author of the *Gesta Francorum*, Peter Tudebode, Robert the Monk, and Albert of Aachen mention the Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans in the Balkans, modern scholars could not ignore this subject.<sup>301</sup> While the image of the Byzantines in the eyes of the Crusaders is fairly well understood,<sup>302</sup> the perception of the trans-Danubian nomads by westerners needs further analysis.

- 
- 297 Jonathan Shepard, "Aspects of Byzantine Attitudes and Policy Towards the West in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries," *BF* 13 (1988), 103–9, 115–6.
- 298 Idem, "Mingling with Northern Barbarians: Advantages and Perils," 232.
- 299 See: Peter Frankopan, "Byzantine Trade Privileges to Venice in the Eleventh Century: The Chrysobull of 1092," *Journal of Medieval History* 30 (2004), no. 2, 135–60.
- 300 Idem, *The First Crusade: The Call from the East* (Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2012), 30–1, 37–8, 45, 88. In 1995, Frankopan defended a Master's thesis on "Anna Komnena, the *Alexiad* and the Pechenegs." Since then, he has continued to work on 11th-century Byzantium and the Balkans.
- 301 Runciman, "The First Crusader's Journey across the Balcan Peninsula," 214–5; Idem, "The crusades of 1101," 5; Alfred Duggan, *The Story of the Crusades 1097–1291* (New York: Faber & Faber, 1966), 16, 26, 73–4; Giuseppe Cossuto, "Les 'nomades primitifs' et le croisé normand: les Petchenègues 'byzantins' et Bohemond de Tarante," *Studia et Documenta Turcologica* 2 (2014), 45–53; Valentin L. Portnykh, "Les Byzantins vus par les chroniqueurs de la Première croisade," *Le Moyen Age* 120 (2014), 3–4, 716.
- 302 See, for instance, Basile Skoulatos, "L'auteur anonyme des *Gesta* et le monde byzantin," *Byzantion* 50 (1980), 504–32; Jean Flori, "Quelques aspects de la propagande anti-byzantine dans les sources occidentales de la Première croisade," in *Chemins d'Outre-Mer. Études d'histoire sur la Méditerranée médiévale offertes à Michel Balard*, vol. 1, ed. Damien Coulon et al. (Paris: Éditions de la Sorbonne, 2004), 331–43; Léan Ní Chléirigh, "The Impact of the First Crusade on Western Opinion towards the Byzantine Empire: The *Dei Gesta per Francos* of Guibert of Nogent and the *Historia Hierosolymitana* of Fulcher of Chartres," in *The Crusades and the Near East. Cultural Histories*, ed. Conor Kostick (New York: Routledge, 2011), 161–88.

## 5 Oriental Studies

Sources in Eastern languages (Arabic, Persian, Hebrew, Syriac, Armenian, Georgian, and others) are generally unforthcoming about Byzantium's relations with the nomads of the North Pontic steppes and the Balkans in the 10th to early 12th century.<sup>303</sup> Most of them report primarily on the early history of the Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans, their time in Central Asia, the Urals-Altai region, and the steppes between the Don and Volga. However, the early past of these peoples, their social organization, economy, religious beliefs, languages, military skills, and other aspects of their life are also important for the study of the "European" portion of their history.

Most of the Oriental sources relating to the history of the Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans were published and translated into various European languages as early as the 19th to the first half of the 20th centuries; a number of fresh editions,<sup>304</sup> translations, and studies<sup>305</sup> appeared during the second half of the 20th century. But, while sources for the history of "state" peoples were

303 The best-known Eastern source testimony touching on Byzantine-nomadic relations includes al-Mas'ūdi's report on the Pecheneg participation in the Magyar invasion of Byzantium (in *Meadows of Gold and Mines of Gems*) and in the Balkan expeditions of Sviatoslav (in *Kitāb al-tanbīh wa al-ishrāf* [The Book of Notification and Verification]); the reference in the so-called Schechter Letter to the involvement of the PYYNYL (who are interpreted as the Pechenegs – see below) in the Byzantine coalition against Khazaria in the 10th century; the notices by Ibrahim Ibn Yaqub (via al-Bakrī) and Ibn Ḥawqal concerning the geographic situation of the Pechenegs in relation to Byzantium; Matthew of Edessa's statement about the Uz invasion of the Balkans; and reports by Michael the Syrian (via Basil, the bishop of Edessa) about the Battle of Beroia and by Benjamin of Tudela about Pecheneg merchants in Constantinople in the 1160s.

304 See, for instance, Ḥudūd al-Ālam. "The Regions of the World": A Persian Geography: AH 372 – AD 982.

305 Here are just a few of these publications: *The Risalah of Ibn Faḍlān: An Annotated Translation with Introduction* by James E. McKeithen [Ph.D. thesis] (Ann Arbor, 1979); *Matthew of Edessa: Armenia and the Crusades, Tenth to Twelfth Centuries. The Chronicle of Matthew of Edessa*, transl. and comment. Ara E. Dostourian (Lanham: University Press of America, 1993); *The Meadows of Gold. The Abbasids*, eds. and transl. Paul Lunde and Caroline Stone (London: Kegan Paul, 1989); Ahmad M.H. Shboul, *Al-Mas'ūdi and His World. A Muslim Humanist and His Interest in Non-Muslims* (London: Ithaca Press, 1979); *Jüdische Reisen im Mittelalter: Benjamin von Tudela; Petachja von Regensburg*, transl., ed. and comment. Stefan Schreiner (Leipzig: Verlag Sammlung Dieterich, 1991); Tara L. Andrews, *Matt'eos Urhayec'i and His Chronicle History as Apocalypse in a Crossroads of Cultures* (The Medieval Mediterranean, 108) (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2017). See also: *Orientalische Berichte über die Völker Osteuropas*; Zimonyi, "The State of the Research on the Prehistory of the Hungarians," 89.

published and studied systematically,<sup>306</sup> similar work on the source testimony concerning the medieval Turkic nomads depended more on the vagaries of personal research interests.

István Zimonyi, in collaboration with Hansgerd Göckenjan and based on previous research by Mihály Kmoskó, published the sections of the *Jayhānī Tradition*<sup>307</sup> dealing with the peoples of Eastern Europe and Central Asia in general, including the Pechenegs, Uzes, Cumans (Kipchaks, Kuns), Khazars, and others.<sup>308</sup> The publication was accompanied by a historical and philological commentary, substantially supplementing the information on Eastern Europe found in the *DAI*.<sup>309</sup>

Hansgerd Göckenjan (1938–2005),<sup>310</sup> a long-time professor at Justus Liebig University of Giessen, is best known for his work on auxiliary peoples and border guards in medieval Hungary.<sup>311</sup> Using published narrative sources and charters, he sketched out a picture of the settlement and activities in Hungary of peoples and ethnic groups from the East, such as the Pechenegs, Szeklers, Kavars, Khalizs, Nyéks, and Kék-kends. Göckenjan deliberately excluded the Cumans and Alans from consideration and focused on those ethnic groups (including Finno-Ugric and Iranian) that had been ignored by historians. The German Orientalist demonstrated the prominent role played by various Eastern peoples in Hungary during the Árpadian era: thus, the Iranian-speaking Khalizs controlled the slave and salt trade and minted coin, while the Turkic-speaking Pechenegs, Szeklers, and Kavars gave the Hungarian army advantage on the battlefield (especially in the battles on the Olsava River and between the rivers Leitha and Fischa in 1146).<sup>312</sup> The integration of Oriental peoples into Hungarian society is much better documented than that of the Pechenegs,

306 *Arabski izvori za bŭlgarite. Khristomatiya*, ed. Rayna Zaimova (Sofia: Tangra TanNakRa, 2000); *Drevnyaya Rus' v svete zarubezhnykh istochnikov: Khrestomatiya*, vol. 3, *Vostochnyye istochniki*, eds. Tatyana M. Kalinina et al. (Moscow: Russkiy fond sodeystviya obrazovaniyu i nauke, 2009). For Hungarian publications, see Chapter 2.

307 The lost work of al-Jayhānī, geographer at the court of the Samanids in the 10th century, is believed to have been a source for other authors writing on the steppe peoples of the 10th century (Ibn Rusta, Gardīzī, Al-Marwazī, Al-Bakrī, and others), as well as for the treatise *Hudūd al-‘ālam: Zimonyi, Muslim Sources on the Magyars*, 18–36.

308 *Orientalische Berichte über die Völker Osteuropas*.

309 See reviews by Marek M. Dziekan, in *Studia Źródloznawcze* 41 (2003), 170; and Ulrich Rebstock, in *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 154 (2004), no. 2, 526–8.

310 About him: Norbert Kersken: "Hansgerd Göckenjan (1938–2005)," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 54 (2006), 470–2.

311 He defended his dissertation at the University of Münster: Göckenjan, *Hilfsvölker und Grenzwächter im mittelalterlichen Ungarn*.

312 *Ibid.*, 141.

Uzes, and Cumans into the 12th-century social milieu of Byzantium and Rus', and thus their life and activities in Hungary can serve as a model for the study of nomadic presence in the Balkans and Rus'.

Göckenjan devoted a special work to al-Ġarnāṭī, an Arab historian who lived in the former Khazar capital of Saqsīn (Itil) from 1131 to 1153 and visited Hungary, Rus', Volga Bulgaria, and the Pechenegs.<sup>313</sup> The scholar from Giessen also wrote on the social and military organization,<sup>314</sup> customary law,<sup>315</sup> and symbolism<sup>316</sup> of the Altaic peoples.

Polish Orientalists have traditionally shown sustained interest in the Oriental sources for the history of Eurasia. Tadeusz Lewicki (1906–92) initiated and edited a collection of Arab sources for the history of the Slavs<sup>317</sup> and studied the writings of al-Idrīsī.<sup>318</sup> Edward Tryjarski (1923–2021) in 1961 defended a

- 
- 313 Hansgerd Göckenjan, "Legende oder Wirklichkeit? Nachrichten über das östliche Europa im Werk des arabischen Reisenden Abū Ḥamid al Andalusī al-Ġarnāṭī (1080–1170)," in *Ungarn, Türken und Mongolen: kleine Schriften von Hansgerd Göckenjan* (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica, 74) (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2007), 499–532 [first published in 2000]. On this source, see also: Ivan Hrbek, "Ein arabischer Bericht über Ungarn (Abū Ḥamid Al-Andalusī Al-Ġarnāṭī, 1080–1170)," *Acta Orientalia ASH* 5 (1955), no. 3, 205–30. Göckenjan also contributed commentary to the Vienna edition of the *DAI*: Günter Prinzing, "[Review of:] *Die Byzantiner und ihre Nachbarn. Die De administrando imperio genannte Lehrschrift des Kaiseros Konstantinos Porphyrogennetos für seinen Sohn Romanos*. Übersetzt, eingeleitet und erklärt von Klaus Belke und Peter Soustal. Wien: Fassbaender, 1995. 358 s.," *BZ* 91 (1998), no. 1, 105.
- 314 Hansgerd Göckenjan, "Zur Stammesstruktur und Heeresorganisation altaischer Völker," in *Europa Slavica – Europa Orientalis. Festschrift für Herbert Ludat zum 70. Geburtstag*, eds. Klaus-Detlev Grothusen and Klaus Zernack (Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1980), 51–86; Hansgerd Göckenjan, "Die Welt der frühen Reitervölker," in *Die Mongolen und ihr Weltreich*, ed. Arne Z. Eggebrecht (Mainz: Verlag Phillip von Zabern in Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1989), 7–43; Hansgerd Göckenjan, "Kundschafter und Späher. Ein Beitrag zur Strategie und Taktik reiternomadischer Kriegsführung," *Acta Orientalia ASH* 53 (2000), no. 3–4, 187–202.
- 315 Idem, "Eskü és szerződés az altaji népeknél," in *Honfoglalás és néprajz*, ed. László Kovács and Attila Paládi-Kovács (Budapest: Balassi Kiadó, 1997), 333–45.
- 316 Hansgerd Göckenjan, "Der Waffengürtel der altaischen Völker als Trachtbestandteil, Symbolträger und Rangabzeichen," in *Bahşi Ögdisi. Festschrift für Klaus Röhrborn*, eds. Jens P. Laut and Mehmet Ölmez (Freiburg/Istanbul: Simurg, 1998), 113–48; Hansgerd Göckenjan, "Bogen, Pfeil und Köcher in der Herrschafts- und Rechtssymbolik der eurasischen Steppenvölker," *Acta Orientalia ASH* 58 (2005), no. 1, 59–76.
- 317 *Źródła arabskie do dziejów Słowiańszczyzny*, 4 vols, eds. Tadeusz Lewicki et al. (Wrocław/Cracow: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1956–1988). See also his "Les sources hébraïques consacrées à l'histoire de l'Europe centrale et orientale et particulièrement à celle des pays slaves de la fin du IXe jusqu'au milieu du XIIIe siècle," *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique* 2 (1961), no. 2, 228–41.
- 318 Idem, *Polska i kraje sąsiednie w świetle "Księgi Rogera" geografii arabskiego z XII w. al-Idrīsīego*, 2 vols (Cracow: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 1945–1954).

dissertation on the Armenian-Kipchak language, studied the languages, history, and culture of the medieval Turkic peoples of Europe, attempted to read the runic inscriptions at Murfatlar and Pliska,<sup>319</sup> and drew attention to the need for closer study of the Polish sources for the history of the Altaic peoples.<sup>320</sup> Tryjarski was particularly interested in nomadic religious beliefs<sup>321</sup> and, like Lewicki earlier, in relations between Poland and the Pechenegs.<sup>322</sup> He authored the first monographic study of the Pechenegs in Polish historiography.<sup>323</sup> Given its length, detailed discussion of the historiography and sources, and the range of the issues considered (such as geographical settings and environments inhabited by the Pechenegs, the history of their migrations and relations with neighboring peoples, including Byzantium,<sup>324</sup> and various aspects of their material and nonmaterial culture), Tryjarski's study was at the time one of the most informative works on these nomads.

Teresa Nagrodzka-Majchrzyk's essay on the Khazars<sup>325</sup> came out under one cover with Tryjarski's monograph on the Pechenegs. Nagrodzka-Majchrzyk

- 
- 319 Edward Tryjarski, "Alte und neue Probleme der runenartigen Inschriften Europas. Ein Versuch der Entzifferung der Texte aus Murfatlar und Pliska," in *Runen, Tamgas und Graffiti aus Asien und Osteuropa*, ed. Klaus Rohrborn and Wolfgang Veenker (Wiesbaden: In Kommission bei O. Harrassowitz, 1985), 53–80.
- 320 Edward Tryjarski, "O projekcie i potrzebie opracowania publikacji 'Ludy altajskie w polskich źródłach pisanych do połowy XVI w.," *Sprawozdania z prac naukowych Wydziału I Nauk Społecznych PAN* (1967), no. 2, 73–86; Idem, "Some Early Polish Sources and Their Importance for the History of the Altaic World," *Journal of Asian History* 3 (1969), no. 1, 34–44.
- 321 Idem, "Les religions des Petchenègues," in *Traditions religieuses et para-religieuses des peuples altaïques. Communications présentées au XIIIe Congrès de la "Permanent International Altaistic Conference," Strasbourg, 25–30 juin 1970* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1972), 139–48; Idem, *Zwyczajne pogrzebowe ludów tureckich na tle ich wierzeń* (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 1991); Dashkevych and Tryjarski, *Kamennyye baby Prichernomorskikh stepy. Kolleksiya iz Askanii-Nova*.
- 322 Edward Tryjarski, "A Note on the Relations between the Pechenegs and Poland," in *Studia Turcica*, ed. Lajos Ligeti (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1971), 461–8.
- 323 Idem, "Pieczyngowie." Reviews by Maciej Salamon and Tadeusz Lewicki in, respectively, *Kwartalnik Historyczny* (1976), no. 4, 908–11 and *Kwartalnik historii kultury materialnej* (1976), no. 3, 476–80.
- 324 Tryjarski, "Pieczyngowie," 517–20.
- 325 Teresa Nagrodzka-Majchrzyk, "Chazarowie," in Dąbrowski, Nagrodzka-Majchrzyk and Tryjarski, *Hunowie Europejscy, Protobułgarzy, Chazarowie, Pieczyngowie*, 377–477. Reviewed by Peter B. Golden in "Khazars Studies: Achievements and Perspectives," 36–7. One of the pioneers of Khazar studies in Poland was Ananiasz Zajączkowski (1903–1970). See his *Ze studiów nad zagadnieniem chazarским* (Kraków: Nakładem Polskiej Akademii Umiejętności, 1947). Zajączkowski also studied the *Codex Cumanicus*. See: Stoyanov, *Kumanologiya: Istoriografski eskizi*, 2, 12–3.

also published studies on the Black Hoods<sup>326</sup> and Torks-Uzes<sup>327</sup> and attempted to trace the genesis of cities among the Turkic peoples.<sup>328</sup> The interest of Polish Orientalists in medieval nomads shows no signs of petering out, as evidenced, for example, by the latest monograph of Aneta Gołębiowska-Tobiasz,<sup>329</sup> who continues the tradition started by Edward Tryjarski.

Peter Benjamin Golden studied under Ihor Ševčenko and Tibor Halasi-Kun.<sup>330</sup> After defending a dissertation on the Khazars,<sup>331</sup> one of his first publications was an article on the migrations of the Oghuz tribes.<sup>332</sup> Golden sees the Oghuzes, much like the Pechenegs,<sup>333</sup> as a conglomerate of tribes of diverse languages and origins.<sup>334</sup> Their pressure forced the Pechenegs, who initially resided north of the Aral Sea and the Syr Darya River (and before that in Mā Warā' an-Nahr, i.e. Transoxiana),<sup>335</sup> to move to the area between the Volga and

- 
- 326 Teresa Nagrodzka-Majchrzyk, *Czarni klobucy* (Warsaw: Wydawnictwa Geologiczne, 1985).
- 327 Eadem, "Aus den Studien über die Schwarzen Klobuken," *RO* 45 (1986), 101–8; Eadem, "Les Oghouz dans la relation d'Ahmad Ibn Fadlan," *RO* 49 (1994), no. 2, 167–9.
- 328 Eadem, "Miasta chazarskie Itil i Sarkel," *Przegląd Orientalistyczny* 85 (1973), no. 1, 45–50; Eadem, *Geneza miast u dawnych ludów tureckich (VII–XII w.)* (Wrocław: Instytut Historii Kultury Materialnej Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 1978). As Peter Golden points out, "she has excluded reports in the sources on the towns of the Pechenegs, Kimeks, Cumans, and Chërnye Klobuki from her study": Peter B. Golden, "[Review of:] Nagrodzka-Majchrzyk Teresa, *Geneza miast u dawnych ludów tureckich (VII–XII w.)*. Wrocław: Ossolineum. 1978. Pp. 168. 40 Zł.," *The American Historical Review* 84 (1979), no. 4, 1134.
- 329 Aneta Gołębiowska-Tobiasz, *Monumental Polovtsian Statues in Eastern Europe, the Archaeology, Conservation and Protection* (London: Versita, 2013).
- 330 See Victor Spinei, "A Qagan of Eurasian-Oriental Studies: Peter B. Golden," in Peter B. Golden, *Studies on the Peoples and Cultures of the Eurasian Steppes*, ed. Catalin Hriban (Bucharest: Editura Istros, 2011), 9–14.
- 331 Peter B. Golden, *Khazar Studies. An Historico-Philological Inquiry into the Origins of the Khazars*, 2 vols (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1980).
- 332 Idem, "The Migrations of the Oğuz." Notably, in this piece Peter Golden draws on the accomplishments of Russian, Turkmenistani, Hungarian, Turkish, and other national historiographies (Kononov, Agadzhanov, Németh, Orkun, Sümer, et al.).
- 333 On the names of the Pechenegs in Arabic and other Eastern sources, see: Peter B. Golden, "The People NWKRDH," *AEMAE* 1 (1975), 21–35. On Turkic nomads in the work of Mahmūd al-Kāshgharī: Idem, "The Turkic World in Mahmūd al-Kāshgharī," in *Complexity of Interaction along the Eurasian Steppe Zone in the First Millennium CE*, eds. Jan Bemmman and Michael Schmauder (Bonn: VFG-Arch Press, 2015), 503–55. See also his article "Pechenegs," in *Encyclopaedia of Islam. N.E.*, vol. 8, eds. C.E. Bosworth et al. (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 289–91.
- 334 The name "Oghuz" itself means clan, tribe, tribal union: *Ibid.*, 45–8, 54; Idem, "Imperial Ideology and the Sources of Political Unity amongst the pre-Činggisid Nomads of Western Eurasia," *AEMAE* 2 (1982), 67.
- 335 *Ibid.*, 53 (map 1), 58.

the Urals, then north of the Black Sea, and finally to the Balkans.<sup>336</sup> The appearance of the Pechenegs in the steppes west of the Don prompted Byzantium to reorient its policies from the Khazars to these newcomers. Their function, according to Golden, was to protect Crimea.<sup>337</sup> The joint actions of Rus' and the Oghuzes led to the fall of the Khazar Khaganate, which had for a long time been an obstacle in the path of Turkic migration to the West. The decline of the Samanid state had a similar effect. Byzantium immediately felt the consequences: descendants of the Oghuz tribes, the Seljuks and Ottoman Turks, made their way into Asia Minor, while the Pechenegs and Torks-Uzes advanced towards the Balkans through the steppes north of the Black Sea.<sup>338</sup> The threat from the Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans on the Balkans became one of the factors that contributed to the easy occupation of Anatolia by the Oghuzes.<sup>339</sup>

While, as noted by Golden, the Oghuzes were able to create their own state,<sup>340</sup> the Pechenegs remained "a loose, unstable tribal confederation," and even their leader (*mihtar* – that is, "prince," "lord," according to *Ḥudūd al-ʿālam*) stood below the khagan (*khāqān*) in the hierarchy of steppe rulers.<sup>341</sup> The American Orientalist is not inclined to trust the 13th-century Arab author Abu Saʿīd, who speaks of a Pecheneg khaganate with the capital in the city of Bajanakīya, where power was passed down from father to son.<sup>342</sup> Peter Golden devoted a special article to the issue of the stateless existence of some Turkic peoples.<sup>343</sup> In his view, the Pechenegs and Cumans lost the Turkic imperial tradition, at least in part owing to their proximity to sedentary states – Rus', Byzantium, Khwarezm, and the state of the Sasanids.<sup>344</sup> However, the absence

336 Ibid., 58–9, 75; Idem, "Peoples of the south-Russian Steppes," in *The Cambridge History of Early Inner Asia*, vol. 1, ed. Denis Sinor (Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 256–84.

337 Golden, "The Migrations of the Oğuz," 75–6.

338 Ibid., 81–83. Cf.: Omeljan Pritsak, "The Decline of the Empire of the Oghuz Yabghu," *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.* 2 (1952), no. 2(4), 292.

339 Peter B. Golden, "War and Warfare in the pre-Činggisid Western Steppes of Eurasia," in *Studies on the Peoples and Cultures of the Eurasian Steppes*, 81.

340 Ibid., 72.

341 Golden, "Peoples of the south-Russian Steppes," 273.

342 Idem, *An Introduction to the History of the Turkic Peoples. Ethnogenesis and State Formation among the Turkic Peoples of Medieval Eurasia* (Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 1992), 267.

343 Idem, "Imperial Ideology and the Sources of Political Unity amongst the pre-Činggisid Nomads of Western Eurasia."

344 Ibid., 73–6. At the same time, this imperial tradition survived among the Oghuzes and, surprisingly, the Hungarians, who were not Turkic-speaking: Ibid., 61–3. See also: Peter B. Golden, "The Qipčaq of Medieval Eurasia: An Example of Stateless Adaptation in the Steppes," in *Rulers from the Steppe: State Formation on the Eurasian Periphery*, eds.

of centralized political leadership did not have to be an obstacle to prosperity among the nomads, including the Pechenegs.<sup>345</sup>

In a number of works, Golden questions the generally accepted idea that nomads were the eternal rivals of sedentary peoples and aggressors by default. According to him, the reason for this view of the relationship between sedentary and nomadic societies lies in the fact that only “sedentary culture narratives” have come down to us.<sup>346</sup> Thus, he sees the Pechenegs less as conquerors than as a people who constantly faced threats from their neighbors, namely the Oghuzes, Khazar Khaganate, Rus’, or Byzantium.<sup>347</sup> As for the obstacles to Russo-Byzantine trade posed by the Pechenegs, Golden argues that they were not significant, because otherwise the Rus’ sources would have spoken of them. Wars between the Pechenegs and Rus’ were short; they were caused either by aggression on the part of Kyiv or by financial incentives from Constantinople, or represented simply “raiding, which nomads viewed as part of a ‘normal’ relationship with the sedentary world.” The Pechenegs never sought to occupy any part of Rus’; they were much more interested in international commerce.<sup>348</sup> Golden explains their incursions into the Balkan lands by the damage they had suffered as a result of pressure from Rus’ and the Oghuzes.<sup>349</sup> As long as a steppe people did not have a state, it did not pose a serious threat to the neighboring states, because it did not seek to seize their territory.<sup>350</sup>

Another explanation Golden offers for nomadic raiding is that the nomadic economy was not self-sufficient and required a range of foodstuffs and handicrafts that nomads could not produce on their own. There were several ways to obtain such things, including trade, “taxation,” or plunder. If the first two methods failed, the nomads attacked.<sup>351</sup> On such raids, they seized crops they could consume, handicrafts they could easily sell or trade for something

---

Gary Seaman and Daniel Marks (Los Angeles: Ethnographics Press, Center for Visual Anthropology, University of Southern California, 1991), 132–57.

345 Peter B. Golden, “Nomads and Their Sedentary Neighbors in pre-Činggisid Eurasia,” *AEMAE* 7 (1987–1991), 54.

346 *Ibid.*, 42.

347 *Ibid.*, 54.

348 See also: Peter B. Golden, “Aspects of the Nomadic Factor in the Economic Development of Kievan Rus,” in *Ukrainian Economic History. Interpretive Essays*, ed. Ivan S. Koropeckyj (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1991), 58–101.

349 Golden, “Nomads and Their Sedentary Neighbors in pre-Činggisid Eurasia,” 58.

350 *Ibid.*, 80–1.

351 *Ibid.*, 68–71. These ideas evidently influenced the genesis of Stephenson’s conception of “trading, not raiding.”



else, and captives for sale into slavery. Hiring themselves out as mercenaries was another source of income for them.

Golden wrote several chapters for *The Cambridge History of Early Inner Asia*<sup>352</sup> and authored a kind of encyclopedia of early Turkic history – *An Introduction to the History of the Turkic Peoples*.<sup>353</sup> He made important contributions to the study of the language, history, way of life, religion, and customs of the Cumans.<sup>354</sup>

Peter Golden's range of scholarly interests was shared by the US Orientalists Omeijan Pritsak and Thomas Schaub Noonan. Omeijan Pritsak (1919–2006), an American Orientalist of Ukrainian descent, began making forays into the history of medieval nomads quite late in his career.<sup>355</sup> Studying the remnants of the Hunnic language, he turned to the languages of the peoples who he believed were descended from the Huns – the Bulgars and Chuvashes. Thus appeared his work on the *Nominalia* of the Bulgarian khans and the language of the Proto-Bulgarians, in which Pritsak also considered the Pecheneg language.<sup>356</sup> Earlier, Pritsak had published a habilitation study on the names and titles of rulers among the Altaic peoples, offering an explanation of the ethnonym "Pečeneg<Bačanag": in his view, it derived from the title of the head of a tribal union who was part of the circle of "brothers-in-law" (*Schwägerstämme*) with whom the ruling East Turkic lineage maintained dynastic ties.<sup>357</sup> Also worth noting is Pritsak's article on the decline of the Oghuz state, which caused another wave of nomadic migration to the West.<sup>358</sup>

As his interest in philology to some extent waned, Omeijan Pritsak turned to a more "historical" study of sources for the history of Eurasia. In 1967, he published a paper on the social and economic transformations among the

352 Including "The Peoples of the Russian Forest Belt" and "Peoples of the South-Russian Steppes" (pp. 229–55, 256–84) in *The Cambridge History of Early Inner Asia*.

353 For chapters on the history of the Oghuzes, Khazars, Magyars, Pechenegs, and Cumans, see: Golden, *An Introduction to the History of the Turkic Peoples*, 205–82.

354 Stoyanov characterizes Peter Golden's research on the Cumans as a veritable "era" in the study of that people. For details on this, as well as a bibliography, see: Stoyanov, *Kumanologiya: Istoriografski eskizi*, 2, 414–73.

355 About him: Lyubomyr A. Hajda, "Omeijan Pritsak: A Biographical Sketch," in *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 3–4 (1979–1980), no. 1, 1–6.

356 Omeijan Pritsak, *Die Bulgarische Fürstenliste und die Sprache der Prorobulgaren* (Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 1955), 85–90.

357 Idem, "Stammesnamen und Titulaturen der altaischen Völker," *UAJ* 24 (1952), no. 1–2, 52 and 79. See also: Louis Bazin, "À propos du nom des 'Petchenègues,'" in *Passé turco-tatar, présent soviétique: Études offertes à Alexandre Bennigsen*, eds. Chantal Lemerancier-Quellejay et al. (Louvain/Paris: Peeters, 1986), 67–77.

358 Idem, "The Decline of the Empire of the Oghuz Yabghu."

Pechenegs.<sup>359</sup> According to Pritsak, the Pecheneg ruling elite (i.e. the Kangar tribes) were Iranian speakers.<sup>360</sup> Initially, the Pechenegs were a mercantile people controlling the routes from Central Asia to Volga Bulgaria and Eastern Europe, but their defeat in the struggle against the Oghuzes and their allies, the Karluks and Kimaks, forced them not only to relocate to the steppes between the Volga and the Urals, but also to switch to nomadic herding, with trade receding to the sidelines.<sup>361</sup> After 1036, the Pechenegs derived most of their income from military service for Byzantium and the sale of captives.<sup>362</sup>

Like Golden, Pritsak in his brief study raised the question of whether the Pechenegs had a state, which he answered in the affirmative.<sup>363</sup> Pritsak described the social system of the Pechenegs as a form of military democracy, where “all matters of great importance were decided by a general council.”<sup>364</sup> He located the court of the Pecheneg khagan and the meeting place of this general council (*komenton*, according to him), as well as “the city of tents” reached by Bruno of Querfurt, in Poróssya (the Ros’ River region). In the period before 1036, the population under Pecheneg control ranged between 2.8 and 3 million people, but after 1048 it was reduced to around 800,000. This population was not homogeneous; it was a “poly-ethnic, multi-lingual and non-territorial professional community.” Pritsak attributed the decline of the Pecheneg state

359 Idem, “The Pečenegs. A Case of Social and Economic Transformation,” *AEMAE* 1 (1975), 211–35.

360 Ibid., 212–4. This hypothesis was rejected by Peter Golden and a number of other Altaists.

361 Idem, “Pechenihy,” 96–7.

362 Ibid., 97.

363 Ibid. Omeljan Pritsak formulated his understanding of the origin of the nomadic state (nomadic *pax*) in an article that would later become the basis for his *magnum opus* of the same name: a “nomadic *pax* is a confederation of several tribes whose primary source of existence is the grazing of livestock. The military mobility of these tribes ensures the functioning of international trade and the control of trade routes, which are the real bases of the nomad economy. A nomadic *pax* cannot emerge nor exist *per se*. Rather, it always develops in response to the challenge of a sedentary society” (O. Pritsak, “The Origin of Rus’,” *Russian Review* 36 (1977), no. 3, 257). See also: Idem, *The Origin of Rus’*, vol. 1, *Old Scandanavian Sources Other than the Sagas* (Cambridge, Mass.: Ukrainian Research Institute of Harvard University, 1981), 15–7. We will not speculate on the reasons why Pritsak developed a vision of the state in which the latter could not evolve independently in either nomadic or sedentary society and could only emerge out of an external impulse. We will merely note that his outlook on society and politics took shape under the influence of the works of the Ukrainian conservative monarchist Viacheslav Lypyns’kyi (1882–1931) and was reinforced by the historian’s friendship with the last monarch of independent Ukraine Pavlo Skoropads’kyi (1873–1945). See: Taiisiya Sydorchuk, “Pavlo Skoropads’kyi ta Omeljan Pritsak: do istoriyi vzyayemostosunkiv ta spivpratsi,” *Ukrayins’kyy arkhoehrafichnyy shchorichnyk* 24–25 (2018), 525–38.

364 Idem, “Pechenihy,” 97.

and people to their numerous military defeats from their neighbors, namely the Uzes, Cumans, Rus', and Byzantium. As a result of his victory over the Pechenegs in 1036, Yaroslav the Wise, in Pritsak's view, accomplished a *translatio imperii*, as Charlemagne had done earlier by defeating the Avars, and Otto I – by eliminating the Hungarian threat. Afterwards, the Pechenegs of the North Pontic steppes merged into the Oghuzes and Cumans, and the Balkan Pechenegs – into the Bulgarians and Cumans. Only in Hungary did the Pechenegs survive for a while longer as a distinct people.<sup>365</sup>

In 1982, Norman Golb and Omeljan Pritsak published a critical edition of Hebrew sources for the early history of Eastern Europe.<sup>366</sup> One of the ethnonyms mentioned in the so-called “Schechter Letter,” PYYNYL, was interpreted by Pritsak as referring to the Pechenegs.<sup>367</sup> The ‘SY (Alans-Iasians), TWRQY’ (Torks-Uzes), and BM (Black Bulgars) were allies of Byzantium (MQDWN) in its war against Khazaria.<sup>368</sup> Omeljan Pritsak also showed great interest in the Cumans.<sup>369</sup> In his view, the campaigns of various Rus' princes against the Cumans in the 12th century can be explained by the fact that the Cumans began to threaten the security of the trade routes to Byzantium. The nomads did not so much obstruct this trade as tried to take it over. The main center of Cuman-Byzantine commerce was Cherson.<sup>370</sup>

The economic aspects of nomadic life and of nomads' interactions with sedentary peoples were treated in the works of Thomas Noonan (1938–2001).<sup>371</sup> Noonan's greatest accomplishments lay in the field of numismatics – he studied the history of dirham circulation in Eastern Europe and founded the international project “Dirham Hoards from Medieval Western Eurasia, c.700-c.1100.”<sup>372</sup> Noonan viewed political and economic relations between

365 Idem, “The Pečenegs. A Case of Social and Economic Transformation,” 227–33.

366 Norman Golb and Omeljan Pritsak, *Khazarian Hebrew Documents of the Tenth Century* (Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press, 1982)

367 Ibid., 132–4. This identification had been previously suggested by Pavel Kokovtsov: Idem, *Yevreysko-khazariskaya perepiska v X veke* (Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR, 1932), 35 and 117.

368 Golb and Pritsak, *Khazarian Hebrew Documents of the Tenth Century*, 132–4. Zuckerman interpreted these events somewhat differently: Constantin Zuckerman, “On the Date of the Khazars' Conversion to Judaism.” See also: Thomas S. Noonan, “Byzantium and the Khazars: A Special Relationship?” in *Byzantine Diplomacy*, 115–7.

369 See: Stoyanov, *Kumanologiya: Istoriografski eskizi*, 2, 133–42.

370 Pritsak, “Polovtsi,” 116.

371 About him: Roman K. Kovalev, “Thomas S. Noonan, 1938–2001,” *Kritika Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 3 (2002), no. 2, 369–71.

372 For a bibliography of Thomas S. Noonan's numismatic works and a brief overview of his contribution to numismatics, see: Roman K. Kovalev and Gert Rispling, “Thomas S. Noonan in Memoriam,” *Revue numismatique* 158 (2002), 375–83.

peoples and societies in terms of natural niches they occupy. No society is self-sufficient.<sup>373</sup> The environment and circumstances of living shape economic pursuits and necessitate exchanges with other societies (which, however, are not always voluntary).<sup>374</sup>

Noonan analysed economic exchanges between nomadic and sedentary societies using relations between Rus' and the Pechenegs and Cumans as a case study.<sup>375</sup> These nomads proved unable to create successful trading models comparable to those developed by the Sogdians and Khazars, because they did not have a centralized state.<sup>376</sup> Commerce was still there, though less well documented; but it apparently did not have a well-defined "international market center in the steppe lands." It was also passive, in the sense that it was carried out by foreign rather than Cuman and Pecheneg merchants.<sup>377</sup> Slaves and captives, in addition to cattle, were important articles of trade.<sup>378</sup> The nomads, in their turn, needed cereals, spices, nuts, clothes, fabrics, and prestigious jewelry. Sites of commercial interaction could be located along the

- 
- 373 Thus, considering the early history of Rus' and its neighbors, Noonan distinguished five geographical-economic zones: the Black Sea littoral (where a "Byzantinised population perpetuated the urban life"), the steppe, or prairie (where "various Turkic and some Iranian groups practised a pastoral nomadism"), the forest steppe and forest zones (east Slavic agriculturalists), the forest zones of central and north-central Russia (where "Baltic and Finno-Ugrian tribes combined hunting, stock raising and agriculture"), and the tundra and northern taiga of the far north (where "Lapps/Saami and Samoyed Nentsy survived by fishing and hunting"): Thomas S. Noonan, "European Russia, c.500–c.1050," in *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. 3, c.900–c.1024, ed. Timothy Reuter (Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 488.
- 374 Noonan demonstrated that it was not only nomads who raided and plundered sedentary farmers; the reverse could also happen, as when Rus' princes launched raids on Cumans: *Ibid.*, 311–2.
- 375 *Idem*, "Rus', Pechenegs, and Polovtsy: Economic Interaction along the Steppe Frontier in the pre-Mongol Era," *Russian History* 19 (1992), no. 1/4, 301–26.
- 376 *Ibid.*, 305. Patricia Crone related the nonexistence or weakness of state organization among the nomads between the Danube and the Caucasus to the wide expansiveness of the territory they inhabited and the absence of significant geographic barriers across its breadth; "the almost endless steppe lacked a natural centre of expansion": Patricia Crone, *Slaves on Horses: The Evolution of the Islamic Polity* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 20.
- 377 Thomas S. Noonan, "Some Observations on the Economy of the Khazar Khaganate," in *The World of the Khazars*, 230. Nomads needed agricultural and manufactured goods, while farmers valued steppe horses, horned cattle, and sheep. Medieval authors speak of such exchanges only in general terms; however, scholars have at their disposal information about the Muscovite-Nogai trade of the 15th–16th centuries. Considering that the mode of production changed little since the Rus' era, these data, in Noonan's view, may be used to illustrate the trading practices of much earlier times. For instance, in 1533/34 Nogais brought 50,000 horses for sale in Moscow: *Ibid.*, 308.
- 378 Noonan, "Some Observations on the Economy of the Khazar Khaganate," 215.

frontier zone that separated the two worlds. The Pecheneg and Cuman exports of horses and sheep went not only to Rus', but also, as Noonan suggests, to Cherson, Khwarezm, Asia Minor, and other regions. Thus, trade between Rus' and the Pechenegs and Cumans connected the forest and forest steppe zones and the Black Sea and Caspian worlds.<sup>379</sup>

Thomas Noonan was the author of the method of "hoard-count," which involves tracking the increase or decrease in the production of a coin issue through the increase or decrease in the number of hoards containing coins of that issue.<sup>380</sup> Dirham finds from Northern Europe yield comparatively modest quantities of coins minted in 850–890 (in a different version – 875–900).<sup>381</sup> Noonan suggested that one of the factors that led to this "silver crisis" was the appearance of the Hungarians and Pechenegs north of the Black Sea at this time; the newcomers interfered with the Rus'-Muslim commerce.<sup>382</sup> The American Orientalist also addressed the role of the Pechenegs in Byzantine policies in the North Pontic steppes, especially in Constantinople's relations with Khazaria.<sup>383</sup>

Overall, a look at the last 50 years of the study of nomadic history shows that scholars have been increasingly reaching out beyond the written and archaeological sources and showing interest in the anthropological study of nomadic societies.<sup>384</sup>

379 Idem, "Rus', Pechenegs, and Polovtsy: Economic Interaction along the Steppe Frontier in the pre-Mongol Era," 309 and 326. On the Black Sea trade in the 9th to early 13th centuries, see also: Andrew C.S. Peacock, "Black Sea Trade and the Islamic World down to the Mongol Period," in *The Black Sea: Past, Present and Future*, eds. Gülden Erkut and Stephen Mitchell (London/Istanbul: British Institute at Ankara/Istanbul Technical University, the Faculty of Architecture, 2007), 65–72.

380 See: Kovalev and Rispling, "Thomas S. Noonan in Memoriam," 376.

381 Thomas S. Noonan, "The First Major Silver Crisis in Russia and the Baltic, c.875–c.900," *Hikuin* 11 (1985), 41–50; Christoph Kilger, "Kaupang from Afar: Aspects of the Interpretation of Dirham Finds in Northern and Eastern Europe between the Late 8th and Early 10th Centuries," in *Means of Exchange: Dealing with Silver in the Viking Age*, ed. Dagfinn Skre (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2007), 230.

382 Noonan, "Some Observations on the Economy of the Khazar Khaganate," 239.

383 Ibid., 240; Idem, "Byzantium and the Khazars: A Special Relationship?"; Idem, "European Russia, c.500 – c.1050," 499.

384 Anatolii M. Khazanov recently produced a general overview of this field of scholarship, see: Khazanov, *Nomads and the Outside World*, XIX–LIX. Aside from Khazanov's monograph, the work of Denis Sinor (1916–2011), John Masson Smith (1930–2019), Thomas Fredrik Weybye Barth (1928–2016), Rudi Paul Lindner, and Thomas J. Barfield deserves special mention here: Sinor, "Horse and Pasture in Inner Asian History"; John M. Smith Jr., "Turanian Nomadism and Iranian Politics," *Iranian Studies* 11 (1978), no. 1–4, 57–81; Thomas F.W. Barth, *Nomads of South Persia. The Basseri Tribe of the Khamseh Confederacy* (Oslo: Oslo University Press, 1964); Lindner, "Nomadism, Horses and Huns";



International Byzantine and Oriental studies changed significantly after World War II. Powerful centers of Byzantine and Oriental studies emerged at American universities and research institutions, attracting many European scholars. Despite the ideological tensions of the Cold War, international scholarly cooperation burgeoned. Byzantine and Oriental studies gradually ceased to be instruments of imperial ideology and practice, which they predominantly had been in the 19th century. Significant progress was made in the publication of texts and translations of Byzantine, Latin, and Oriental sources, which had a beneficial effect on the quality of new historical research based on these sources. Turkic-speaking nomads were no longer perceived as a uniformly aggressive and hostile element that inhibited the development of sedentary societies; instead, the history of the steppe peoples came to be seen as an organic part of the complex mosaic of medieval European history.

---

Thomas J. Barfield, *The Perilous Frontier. Nomadic Empires and China, 221 BC to AD 1757* (Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers, 1989).

# Conclusions

The salient role played by the Pechenegs, Torks-Uzes, and Cumans-Polovtsi in the history of the Byzantine Empire and neighboring countries in the 10th and 11th centuries has spurred interest in the problem of relations between Byzantium and the nomads of the North Pontic steppe in Byzantine and Oriental studies and in the national historiographies of the countries of the Carpathian-Danubian region.

## 1 Periodization

In his “Byzantium and the Pechenegs” (1872), Vasilii Vasilievskii for the first time posed the problem of the relations between Byzantium and the trans-Danubian nomads, defined the sources for their study, considered in depth an important period in their history (1048–95), and affirmed the importance of the key events in these relations for the history of the empire and Europe as a whole. Vasilievskii’s book was not the first to examine Byzantine-nomadic relations, but it was the first work to treat this subject with such a high degree of scholarly rigor. Even so, this and a number of other works by the Russian Byzantinologist had a clear political undertone, asserting the Russian Empire’s historical claims to Crimea, to influence in the Balkans, and even to control over the Bosphorus and Dardanelles.

From the middle to the beginning of the last third of the 19th century, the study of the history of nomads inside the modern borders of the region’s countries proceeded within the framework of the respective national histories, and was based on a limited set of written sources. Between the last third of the 19th century and the early 1920s, the geographical scope of research broadened. Disciplinary distinctions grew clearer with the publication of significant works in source criticism, linguistics, and local studies. The role of nomads in Byzantine and a number of regional histories was dealt with in depth. First forays into the problem of the origins of various nomadic peoples and their languages appeared, and the archaeological exploration of nomadic material culture got underway.

During the 1920 and 1930s, representatives of several national historiographies of Central, Southeastern, and Eastern Europe and prominent Western historians explored on the basis of written sources the “factology” of nomadic presence in particular regions (Hungary, Romania, Ukraine, Russia,

Bulgaria) and of nomads' relations with Constantinople and the population of Byzantium's Balkan provinces. Linguistic relics of nomads preserved in Greek and other written sources also became a subject of attention.

Moravcsik's *Byzantinoturcica* marked the end of a long era in the study of this book's subject. Combining as it did bibliographic research, source criticism, and linguistic analysis, his work became a comprehensive guide to the history of Turkic-Byzantine relations. At the same time, the publication of the *Byzantinoturcica* signaled that the range of known written sources for the study of the subject was almost exhausted.

The second period in the study of Byzantine-nomadic relations, which began in the mid-20th century and continues to this day, is characterized by changes in the source base and, to an extent, in research methodology, as well as by the widening of the circle of scholars working in this field.

The accumulation of new source material, including archaeological, numismatic, sigillographic, and paleoanthropological, continued into the mid-1960s. Particularly large-scale excavations were carried out in Romania and the USSR. On the basis of the newly-discovered evidence, Pletnyova, Zyablin (1952), and Fyodorov-Davydov (1966) offered their takes on the problem of the ethnic attribution of nomadic burials; Barnea and Diaconu published their first works attempting to interpret the results of the excavation of Byzantine sites on the Lower Danube. The paper presented by the Romanian delegation at the Byzantine studies congress in Oxford in 1966 may be considered the apex of this phase in the study of the subject.

The phase that lasted from 1966 until the fall of the Berlin Wall was marked by the appearance of synthetic works: Diaconu's landmark monographs on the Pechenegs and Cumans on the Lower Danube published in 1970 and 1978, Tüpkova-Zaimova's *The Lower Danube as a Border Zone of the Byzantine West* (1976), the third volume of the Romanian *History of Dobruja* (1971), and others. Medieval "nomadic" archaeology picked up pace quite noticeably. The turning point in the attitudes toward the Pechenegs and other frontier peoples came with the Byzantine studies congress in Bucharest (1971), where Obolensky and Ahrweiler delivered their seminal papers. From the 1970s on, historians also began to take notice of the anthropological dimension of the relations between nomads and sedentary peoples.

The wave of democratic revolutions in Central and Eastern Europe encouraged the region's scholarly communities to abandon outdated ideological clichés and open up to closer international cooperation. The new phase in the study of the subject has also involved much greater attention to numismatic and sigillographic materials.



## 2 Source Base and Methodology

The range of principal Byzantine written sources for the study of the subject was defined early on by Vasilievskii. It gradually expanded, mainly due to the interest of Hungarian, Bulgarian, and Romanian historians and Orientalists in the past of their own nations, and of Soviet scholars – in the medieval history of the North Pontic steppes and history of relations between Rus' and Byzantium. Some written sources provoked debate around their veracity, dating, and interpretation, which often helped to advance the understanding of Byzantine-nomadic relations. New critical editions of Greek, Latin, and Oriental sources, as well as their translations into languages of international communication and national languages, had a great impact on the study of this book's subject.

From the mid-20th century on, large-scale archaeological excavations in the countries of the Balkan-Danubian region and the European part of the USSR brought to light a vast trove of material remains. Burial complexes, pottery and other everyday objects, and coins (primarily used for dating) became a valuable category of sources for the study of Byzantine-nomadic interaction. Historians debated over the nomadic identity of clay kettles, decorations, weapons, and other artifacts discovered over many years of fieldwork. A substantial role in the interpretation of material remains belonged to paleoanthropology.

The importance of numismatics and sigillography for the study of medieval Balkan history was established in the first third of the 20th century. New finds and the publication and cataloging of collections of coins and seals opened possibilities for further research. Wasilewski, Iordanov, Madgearu, and others used the new data to look from a different angle at the administrative history of Byzantium's Balkan provinces in the late 10th and 11th centuries. Numismatics and sigillography allowed Oberländer-Târnoveanu, Mănuclu-Adameşteanu, and Atanasov to date nomadic raids and clarify their routes. Engagement with these disciplines also helped Diaconu, Atanasov, Kirilov, and others to trace the development or decline of various Balkan lands when nomads were present there. Iordanov and Dudek elaborated the interpretation of Kegen's and Tyrach's seals to substantially supplement the written evidence. Toponymics, anthroponymics, and anthropological studies all contributed to our knowledge of Byzantine-nomadic relations.

Transformations in the methodological basis of historical scholarship over the period under consideration have not seriously affected research work. There has not been much change in the methodology of written-source criticism since the 19th century. The Marxist approach did, however, contribute to

the development of archaeology. The spread of the ideas of the Annales School has also had some impact on the progress of studies in the field.

### 3 Byzantium, Nomads, and National Historiographies

The study of Byzantine-nomadic relations has been influenced by trends and developments in the region's national historiographies. Vasilievskii and Uspenskii, in raising questions about the role of the Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans in the historical fortunes of Byzantium and Bulgaria, kept in mind the interests of the Russian Empire in the Balkans. Soviet medievalists addressed the subject either in the context of Rus' foreign policy, as did Levchenko, or in their analysis and criticism of Greek sources, as did Kazhdan, Lyubarskii, and Bibikov.

Bulgarian and Romanian historians investigated the subject against the backdrop of the unending disputes over the time of the establishment of Byzantine rule in Bulgaria, the role of the medieval Bulgarian and Vlach populations in the region of the Lower Danube, the "national" affiliation of such political entities as Tatous, Satzas, or Seslav, known from the sources, and other issues. Hungarian historiography was also guided by national motives, particularly evident in the wave of interest towards nomadic history during the late 19th to mid-20th centuries, in Hungarian Turanism, and in the heated debate with Romanian historians over the time of the appearance of the Romanians and Hungarians in medieval Transylvania. In each of Europe's "socialist" countries, the specifics of the local ruling regime had a marked influence on scholarship. In turn, entry into the EU led to a decreasing interest in nomadic history in Hungary (the so-called rejection of the *Steppenfixierung*) and even in Poland.

In the USSR, the impetus to large-scale archaeological excavations, during which hundreds of nomadic burials were discovered, was given by the policy of industrialization. In Romania, to this was added the aspiration to find via archaeological research answers (or evidence base for answers) to the question of the origin of the Romanian people; in Bulgaria – the desire to show the greatness of the medieval Bulgarian states. No one looked specifically for nomadic remains. Industrialization helped bring to light new archaeological sources while destroying vast swathes of historical and cultural heritage. The state of preservation of archaeological sites and the gradual destruction of archaeological expedition archives in the countries of the former USSR are causes for concern.

The valuable contributions made by Western medievalists to the study of the subject, including the clarification of the dates and locations of some

nomad-related events, mostly came out of the careful study of Greek texts. Once again, such happy outcomes were usually accidental to the original research objectives. The immediate subjects of study were individual written sources, the general political and diplomatic history of Byzantium, or its relations with various states and peoples that would become the basis for modern nations and states. The situation in Oriental studies is somewhat different – there, the history and culture of ancient and medieval nomads has long been an object of sustained attention.

#### 4 Byzantine-Nomadic Relations and International Byzantine and Oriental Studies

Gains in the understanding of this book's subject and general progress in Byzantine and Oriental studies have usually gone hand-in-hand. "Byzantium and the Pechenegs" itself was one of the first synthetic works in Byzantine studies, in which a certain era in the history of the empire was considered as a whole on the basis of a broad and varied set of sources. The same can be said of Chalandon's monographs on the history of the Komnenoi, which substantially complemented the work of Vasilievskiĭ. Advances in the study and publication of Byzantine and Oriental sources during the first half of the 20th century found immediate reflection in the state of research on the topic – the *Byzantinoturcica* is a prime example of this.

The cataloging of Byzantine coins and seals, undertaken at the prominent Byzantine studies centers in Dumbarton Oaks, Vienna, and Paris with the participation of experts from Southeastern Europe, has allowed for a more productive use of this type of sources. Prosopographic databases also show great promise for the field.

International meetings of scholars have been a fountainhead of fresh ideas and directions for the study of Byzantine-nomadic relations. The work of scholars from Southeastern and Central Europe has influenced researchers at the leading centers of Byzantine and Oriental studies. Many specialists from Eastern, Central, and Southeastern Europe were closely involved in the establishment and functioning of such centers.

Recent studies have incorporated the Turkic nomads of the 10th to 13th centuries into the Byzantine *oikumene* and affirmed their "right to exist" in the history of Byzantium and Europe. There remains, however, a need for synthetic works in this field that would build on the accomplishments of the existing historiography and draw on the widest possible array of written and other sources. We need studies that would construct on this broad basis an accurate

model of the political and cultural relations between the Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans on the one hand and Byzantium and neighboring states on the other, from the Pechenegs' appearance on the horizon of imperial diplomacy and until the arrival of the Mongol army on the Danube. Such studies would greatly enrich our knowledge of the history of Eastern and Southeastern Europe and become part of the future comprehensive picture of the history of the medieval nomads of the North Pontic steppes and the Balkans, envisioned back in his day by the Hungarian medievalist Mátyás Gyóni.

# Selected Bibliography

## Primary Sources

- Al-Mas'ūdī, *Bis zu den Grenzen der Erde: Auszüge aus dem 'Buch der Goldwäschen'*, ed. and transl. Gernot Rotter. Tübingen/Basel: Horst Erdmann, 1978.
- Andrews, Tara. L. *Mattēos Urhayec'i and His Chronicle History as Apocalypse in a Crossroads of Cultures*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2017.
- Annae Comnenae Alexias*, vol. 1, *Prolegomena et textus*; vol. 2, *Indices*, eds. Dieter Reinsch and Athanasios Kambylis. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 2001.
- Bartold, Vasilii V. “〈Iz vlecheniye iz sochineniya Gardizi Zayn al-Akhbar〉 Prilozheniye k ‘Otchetu o poyezdke v Srednyuyu Aziyu s nauchnoyu tsel'yu. 1893–1894 gg.’” *Zapiski Imperatorskoy Akademii nauk po istoriko-filologicheskomu otdeleniyu* [Series 8] 1 (1897) no. 4: 78–126.
- Biliarsky, Ivan. *The Tale of the Prophet Isaiah. The Destiny and Meanings of an Apocryphal Text*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2013.
- Consilia et narrations*, Greek text, English trans. and comment. Charlotte Roueché. London: Sharing Ancient Wisdoms, 2013.
- Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Administrando Imperio*, vol. 1, Greek text ed. Gyula Moravcsik, English trans. Romilly J.H. Jenkins. Budapest: Pázmány Péter Tudományegyetemi Görög Filológiai Intézet, 1949); vol. 2, *Commentary*, ed. Romilly J.H. Jenkins. London: Athlone Press, 1962.
- Constantine Porphyrogenetos, *The Book of Ceremonies*, 2 vols, ed. and transl. Anne Moffatt and Maxeme Tall. Canberra: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies, 2012.
- Costantino Porfirogenito de Thematribus*, ed. Agostino Pertusi. Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1952.
- Die Byzantiner und ihre Nachbarn. Die De administrando imperio genannte Lehrschrift des Kaiseros Konstantinos Porphyrogenetos für seinen Sohn Romanos*, trans., ed. and comment. Klaus Belke and Peter Soustal. Vienna: Verlag Fassbaender, 1995.
- Ephraem Aenii Historia chronica*, ed. Odysseus Lapsides. Athens: Akadimía Athinón, 1990.
- Gautier, Paul. “Le typikon du sébaste Grégoire Pakourianos.” *RÉB* 42 (1984): 5–146.
- Georgii Pachymeris Relationes historicae*, 3 vols, eds. Albert Failler and Vitalien Laurent. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1984–1999.
- Golb, Norman and Pritsak, Omeljan. *Khazarian Hebrew Documents of the Tenth Century*. Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press, 1982.
- Heimskringla: eða Sögur Noregskonunga Snorra Sturlusonar*, vol. 3. Uppsala: W. Schultz, 1872.

- Hudūd al-Ālam, "The Regions of the World": A Persian Geography: AH 372 – AD 982*, trans. and expl. Vladimir Minorsky with the preface by Vasiliū V. Bartold, trans. from the Russian and with add. material by the late professor Minorsky, ed. Clifford E. Bosworth. 2nd ed. London: Luzac, 1970.
- Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsis historiarum*, ed. Hans Thurn. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 1973.
- Ioannis Tzetzae Epistulae*, ed. Pietro A.M. Leone. Leipzig: BSB B.G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, 1972.
- Ioannis Tzetzae Historiae*, ed. Pietro A.M. Leone. Naples: Libreria scientifica editrice, 1968.
- Iohannis Euchaitorum Metropolitae Quae in Codice Vaticano Graeco 676 supersunt*, ed. Paulus de Lagarde. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1979.
- Izvěstiya o Khozarakh", Burtasakh", Bolgarakh", Mad'yarakh", Slavyanakh" i Russakh" Abu-Ali Akhmeda Ben" Omar" Ibn"-Dasta, neizvēstnogo doselē arabskago pisatelya nachala X věka, po rukopisi Britanskago muzeya*, ed., trans. and comment. Daniel Chwolson. Saint Petersburg, 1869.
- John Kinnamos. *Deeds of John and Manuel Comnenus*, trans. Charles M. Brand. New York: Columbia University Press, 1976.
- John Skylitzes. *A Synopsis of Byzantine History, 811–1057*, trans. John Wortley. Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Jüdische Reisen im Mittelalter: Benjamin von Tudela; Petachja von Regensburg*, trans., ed. and comment. Stefan Schreiner. Leipzig: Verlag Sammlung Dieterich, 1991.
- Konstantin Bagryanorodnyĭ, *Ob upravlenii imperiyey. Tekst, perevod, kommentarii*, eds. Gennadiĭ G. Litavrin and Anatoliĭ P. Novosel'tsev. Moscow: Nauka, 1989.
- Kovalevskii, Andriĭ P. *Kniga Akhmeda ibn-Fadlana o yego puteshestvii na Volgu v 921–922 gg.: stat'i, perevody i kommentarii*, ed. Boris A. Shramko. Kharkiv: Izdatel'stvo Khar'kovskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta im. A.M. Gor'kogo, 1956.
- Kunick, Arist A. and Rosen, Viktor R. "Izvestiya al-Bekri i drugikh avtorov o Rusi i slavyanakh." In *Zapiski Imperatorskoy Akademii nauk* 32 (1878), no. 2: 1–191.
- La vie de saint Cyrille le Philéote, moine byzantin*, ed. Étienne Sargologos. Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1964.
- Matthew of Edessa: Armenia and the Crusades, Tenth to Twelfth Centuries. The Chronicle of Matthew of Edessa*, trans. and comment. Ara E. Dostourian. Lanham: University Press of America, 1993.
- Michael Attaleiates, *The History*, ed. Anthony Kaldellis and Dimitris Krallis. Cambridge, Mass./London: Harvard University Press, 2012.
- Michaelis Pselli Historia Syntomos*, ed. and trans. Willem Aerts. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 1990.
- Miguel Atalíates, *Historia*, ed. Inmaculada Pérez Martín. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2002.

- Nicéphore Bryennios, *Histoire*, ed. Paul Gautier. Brussels: Byzantion, 1975.
- Nicephori Bryennii Historiarum libri quattuor*, ed. Paul Gautier. Brussels: Byzantion, 1975.
- Nicetae Choniatae Historia*, 2 vols, ed. Jan Louis van Dieten. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1975.
- Nicolai I Constantinopolitani patriarchae Epistolae*, ed. Romilly J.H. Jenkins and Leendert G. Westerink. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1973.
- "Pakourianos: Typikon of Gregory Pakourianos for the Monastery of the Mother of God Petritzonitissa in Bačkovo." In *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents: A Complete Translation of the Surviving Founders' Typika and Testaments*, eds. John Thomas and Angela C. Hero, 507–63. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2000.
- Puteshestviye Abu Khamida al-Garnati v Vostochnuyu i Tsentral'nyuyu Yevropu (1131–1153 gg.)*, ed., transl. and comment. Oleg G. Bolshakov, hist. comment. Alexandr L. Monheit. Moscow: Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury, 1971.
- Ritter, Helmut. "Zum Text von Ibn Fadlan's Reisebericht." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 96 (1942), no. 1: 98–126.
- Sharaf al-Zaman Tahir Marvazi on China, the Turks and India*, ed. Vladimir Minorsky. London: Royal Asiatic Society, 1942.
- Skazaníya musul'manskikh" pisateley o slavyanakh" i russkikh". S" poloviny VII veka do kontsa X veka po R.Kh.* ed., trans. and comment. Avraam Harkavy. Saint Petersburg: Tipografiya Imperatorskoy Akademii nauk, 1870 [part 1]; Harkavy, Avraam. *Dopolneníya k" sochineníyu "Skazaníya musul'manskikh" pisateley o slavyanakh" i russkikh"*. Saint Petersburg: Tipografiya A.O. Tsederbauma, 1871 [part 2].
- Symeonis magistri et logothetae Chronicon*, ed. Staffan Wahlgren. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 2006.
- The Meadows of Gold. The Abbasids*, ed. and trans. by Paul Lunde and Caroline Stone. London: Kegan Paul, 1989.
- The Risalah of Ibn Faḍlān: An Annotated Translation with Introduction* by James E. McKeithen [Ph.D. thesis]. Ann Arbor, 1979.
- The Russian Primary Chronicle. Laurentian text*, trans. and ed. by Samuel H. Cross and Olgerd P. Sherbowitz-Wetzor. Cambridge, Mass.: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1953.
- Theodori Scutariotae Chronica: editio princeps*, ed. Raimondo Tocci. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015.
- Theodoros Prodromos, *Historische Gedichte*, ed. Wolfram Hörandner. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1974.
- Theophylacti Achridensis orationes, tractatus, carmina*, vol. 1, *Theophylacti Achridensis epistulae*; vol. 2, ed. Paul Gautier. Thessaloniki: Association de recherches byzantines, 1980.

- Togan, Ahmet Zeki V. *Ibn Fadlan's Reisebericht*. Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1939.
- Zakhoder, Boris N. *Kaspiyskiy svod svedeniy o Vostochnoy Yevrope*, vol. 1, Gorgan i Povolzh'ye v IX–X vv.; vol. 2, *Bulgary, mad'yary, narody Severa, pechenegi, rusy, slavyane*. Moscow: Nauka, 1962–1967.

### Secondary Sources

- Acsády, Ignác. *A magyar birodalom története*. Budapest: Athenaeum Irodalmi és Nyomdai Részvénytársaság, 1903.
- Agadzhanov, Sergeĭ G. *Ocherki istorii oguzov i turkmen Sredney Azii IX–XIII vv.* Ashgabat: Ylym, 1969.
- Agadzhanov, Sergeĭ G. "Nekotoryye problemy istorii oguzskikh plemen Sredney Azii." In *Tyurkologicheskii sbornik (1970)*, eds. Andreĭ N. Kononov et al., 192–207. Moscow: Nauka, 1970.
- Ahrweiler, Hélène. "La frontière et les frontières de Byzance en Orient." In *Actes du XIVe Congrès*, 1, 209–230.
- Ahrweiler, Hélène. "Citoyens et étrangers dans l'Empire romain d'Orient." In *La nozione di "Romano" tra cittadinanza e universalità. Atti del II Seminario internazionale di studi storici "Da Roma alla terza Roma", 21–23 aprile 1982*, 343–50. Naples: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 1984.
- Ahrweiler, Hélène. "Byzantine Concepts of the Foreigner: The Case of the Nomads." In *Studies on the Internal Diaspora of the Byzantine Empire*, eds. Hélène Ahrweiler and Angeliki E. Laiou, 1–15. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1998.
- Akhinzhanov, Serzhan M. "Iz istorii dvizheniya kochevykh plemon yevraziyskikh stepy v pervoy polovine XI veka." In *Arkheologicheskkiye issledovaniya drevnego i srednevekovogo Kazakhstana*, ed. Kemal' A. Akishev, 46–53. Almaty: Nauka KazSSR, 1980.
- Akhinzhanov, Serzhan M. *Kypchaki v istorii srednevekovogo Kazakhstana*. Almaty: Gylym, 1995.
- Anastasiiu, Florian and Harțușe, Nicolae. "Morminte și călăreți nomazi descoperite în județul Brăila." *ISTROS* 1 (1980), no. 1: 263–80.
- Anchabadze, Zurab V. "Kypchaki Severnogo Kavkaza, po dannym gruzinskikh letopisey XI–XIV vekov." In *O proiskhozhdenii balkartsev i karachayevtsev*, eds. Ilya V. Treskov et al., 113–26. Nalchik: Kabardino-balkarskoye knizhnoye izdatel'stvo, 1960.
- Angelova, Stefka. "Krepostnata stena na Durostorum-Drüstür-Silistra. (Predvaritelno süobshtenie)." *Arkheologiya* (1973) no. 3: 83–93.
- Angelova, Stefka. "Küm topografiyata na srednevekovniya Drüstür prez XII v." In *Prinosi küm bülgarskata arkheologiya*, 2, ed. Dimitür Ovcharov, 52–57. Sofia: Arges, 1993.



- Angelova, Stefka. "Razkopki na tsürkva No 2. Arkheologicheskò prouchvane na Drüstür (14 godini po-küsno)." *Dobrudzha* 20 (2002): 12–39.
- Angelova, Stefka and Doncheva-Petkova, Lyudmila. "Süstavüt na naselenieto v Dobrudzha ot kraya na X do kraya na XI v." In *Vtori mezhdunaroden kongres*, 373–83.
- Angold, Michael. *The Byzantine Empire, 1025–1204: A Political History*. London: Longman, 1984.
- Angold, Michael. "Belle Époque or Crisis? (1025–1118)." In *CHBE*, 583–626.
- Angelov, Dimitür. "Die bulgarischen Slawen und die Nomaden (VI–XII Jahrhundert)." *Pliska-Preslav* 3 (1981): 7–15.
- Antonin (Kapustin), "Zametki XII–XV vekov, otnosyashchiesya k Krymskomu gorodu Sugdeye (Sudaku), pripisannyye na grecheskom Sinaksare." *ZOOID* 5 (1863): 595–628.
- Aristov, Nikolai A. *O Zemle Polovetskoj: Istoriko-geograficheskiy ocherk*. Kyiv: VI. Davydenko, 1877.
- Artamonov, Mikhail I. *Srednevekovyie poseleniya na Nizhnem Donu. Po materialam Severo-Kavkazskoy ekspeditsii*. Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoye sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoye izdatel'stvo, 1935.
- Artamonov, Mikhail I. "Sarkel – Belaya Vezha." In *TVDAE*, 1, 7–84.
- Artamonov, Mikhail I. *Istoriya khazar*. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Gosudarstvennogo Ermitazha, 1962.
- Arutyunova, Vaida A. "K voprosu o vzaimootnosheniyakh Vizantii s pechenegami i polovtsami vo vremya normanskoy kampanii." *VizVrem* 33 (1972): 115–8.
- Atanasov, Georgi. "Etnodemografski promeni v Dobrudzha (X–XVI v.)." *IstPreg* (1991), no. 2: 75–89.
- Atanasov, Georgi. "Pogled kùm dobrudzhanskiya dunavski bryag ot XI do XV v." *IstPreg* (1992), no. 8–9: 13–31.
- Atanasov, Georgi. "Influences ethno-culturelles dans l'ermitage rupestre près de Murfatlar, à Dobrudža." *BS* 57 (1996), no. 2: 112–24.
- Atanasov, Georgi. "Etnodemografski i etnokulturni promeni po Dobrudzhanskoto chernomorie prez srednekovieto." *IstPreg* (1996), no. 2: 3–30.
- Atanasov, Georgi. "Otkoga zapochva secheneto na anonimnite vizantiiski folisi klas 'B' i koga pechenegite opustoshavat Dobrudzha." *Numizmatichni izsledvaniya* (1999), no. 3–4: 33–53. In Russian: "Anonimnyie vizantiyskiye follisy klassa 'B' i nashestviye pechenegov v Dobrudzhu 1036 g." *Stratum plus* (1999), no. 6: 111–22. In French: "De nouveau pour la date initiale de folles byzantines anonymes classe 'B'." In *Sphragistic and Epigraphic Contributions to the History of the Black Sea Coast (Acta Musei Varnaensis, 2)*, eds. Valeri İotov et al., 289–98. Varna: Arkheologicheski muzei, Varna, 2004.
- Atanasov, Georgi. "Klady zemledel'cheskikh orudiy iz Yuzhnoy Dobrudzhi (X – nachalo XI vv.)." *Stratum plus* (2000), no. 5: 183–208.
- Atanasov, Georgi. "Nov pogled kùm demografskite i etnokulturnite promeni v Dobrudzha prez Srednekovieto." *Izsledvaniya v chest na chl. kor. prof. Strashimir*

- Dimitrov*, eds. Vŭrban Todorov et al., 185–214. Sofia: Académie des sciences de Bulgarie, 2001.
- Atanasov, Georgi. *Dobrudzhanskoto despot-stvo: kŭm politicheskata, tsŭrkovnata, stopenanskata i kulturnata istoriya na Dobrudzha prez XIV vek*. Veliko Tarnovo: Faber, 2009.
- Atanasov, Georgi and Ŭordanov, Ivan. *Srednovekovniyat Vetren na Dunav*. Shumen: Slavcho Nikolov i sie, 1994.
- Atanasov, Georgi and Russev, Nikolaĭ D. "Onglos: Pervaya rezidentsiya bolgarskikh kanov na Nizhnem Dunaye i bolgarskoye prisutstviye severneye Dunaya v VII–X vv." In *Bolgarskiy Forum I. Materialy Mezhdunarodnogo Bolgarskogo Forumu (19–21 iyunya 2010 g., Bolgar)*, eds. Rafael S. Khakimov et al., 15–34. Kazan: 000 "Foliant"; Institut istorii im. Sh. Mardzhani AN RT, 2011.
- Atavin, Andreĭ G. "Nekotoryye osobennosti zakhroneniy chuchel koney v kochevnicheskikh pogrebeniyakh X–XIV vv." *SovArkh* (1984), no. 1: 134–43.
- Aybabin, Olexandr I. "Step' i Yugo-Zapadnyy Krym." In *Krym, Severo-Vostochnoye Prichernomor'ye i Zakavkaz'ye v epokhu srednevekov'ya (IV–XIII veka)*, eds. Tatyana I. Makarova, Svetlana A. Pletnyova, 74–81. Moscow: Nauka, 2003.
- Aybabin, Olexandr I. "Goroda i stepi Kryma v XIII–XIV vv. po arkeologicheskim svidetel'stvam." *MAIET* 10 (2003): 277–307.
- Ayönü, Yusuf. "Bizans Ordusunda Ücretli Türk Askerler (XI–XII. Yüzyıllar)." *Turkiyat Arastirmalari Dergisi* 30 (2009), no. 2: 53–69.
- Baĭchorov, Soslanbek Ya. *Drevnetyurkskiye runicheskiye pamyatniki Yevropy: Otnosheniye severokavkazskogo areala drevnetyurkskoy pis'mennosti k volgo-donskomu i dunayskomu arealam*. Stavropol: Stavropol'skoye knizhnoye izdatel'stvo, 1989.
- Bang, Willi. "Über den Volksnamen besenyó." *Túrán* 3 (1918), no. 6–7: 436–7.
- Baranov, Igor A. *Tavrika v epokhu rannego srednevekov'ya (saltovo-mayatskaya kul'tura)*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1990.
- Barnea, Ion. "Relaŭiile dintre așezarea de la Biseriĭuta – Garvân și Bizanŭ în secolele X–XII." *SCIV* 4 (1953), no. 3–4: 641–71.
- Barnea, Ion. "Byzance, Kiev et l'Orient sur le Bas-Danube du X au XII siècle." In *Nouvelles études d'histoire*, vol. 1, *Présentées au Xe Congrès des Sciences historiques, Rome 1955*, 169–80. Bucharest: Éditions de l'Académie de la République populaire roumaine, 1955.
- Barnea, Ion. "Les monuments rupestres de Basarabi en Dobrogea." *Cahiers Archeologiques* 13 (1962): 187–208.
- Barnea, Ion. "L'idol féminin ou 'kamennaia baba'." *SCIV* 13 (1962), no. 1: 191–6.
- Barnea, Ion. "Dinogetia et Noviodunum, deux villes byzantines du Bas-Danube." *RÉSEE* 9 (1971), no. 3: 351–62.
- Barnea, Ion. "Dinogetia – ville byzantine du Bas-Danube." *Vyzantiná* 10 (1980): 237–87.

- Barnea, Ion and Ștefănescu, Ștefan. *Din istoria Dobrogei*, vol. 3, *Byzantini, Români și Bulgari la Dunărea de Jos*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1971.
- Bartold, Vasilii V. "Novyy trud o polovtsakh." *Russkiy istoricheskiy zhurnal* 7 (1921): 138–56.
- Bartold, Vasilii V. "Tyurki." In Bartold, Vasilii V. *Sochineniya*, vol. 5, *Raboty po istorii i filologii tyurkskikh i mongol'skikh narodov*, 576–95. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Vostochnoy literatury, 1968.
- Bartold, Vasilii V. "Dvenadtsat' lektsiy po istorii tyurkskikh narodov Sredney Azii." In *Sochineniya*, 5, 19–192.
- Bartold, Vasilii V. "Khazary." In *Sochineniya*, 5, 597–601.
- Bartold, Vasilii V. "Kipchaki." In *Sochineniya*, 5, 550–1.
- Bartold, Vasilii V. "Guzz." In *Sochineniya*, 5, 524–7.
- Baskakov, Nikolaï A. "Rodoplemennyye nazvaniya kypchakov v toponimii Yuzhnoy Moldavii." In *Toponimika Vostoka: Novyye issledovaniya*, ed. G.P. Bodnarchuk, 46–50. Moscow: Nauka, 1964.
- Baskakov, Nikolaï A. "Mikroetnonimy uzov (oguzov) – chernykh klobukov v russkikh letopisyakh." *Acta Orientalia ASH* 36 (1982), no. 1–3: 39–46.
- Baskakov, Nikolaï A. "Etnonimy i antroponimy pechenegov." In *Studia turcologica memoriae Alexii Bombaci dicata*, eds. Aldo Gallotta and Ugo Marazzi, 12–22. Naples: Istituto Universitario Orientale, 1982.
- Baskakov, Nikolaï A. "Antroponimy i etnonimy drevnikh tyurkov Vostochnoy Yevropy (typy i modeli)." *Balkansko ezikoznanie* 38 (1985), no. 4: 63–5.
- Baski, Imre. "On the Ethnic Names of the Cumans of Hungary." In *Kinship in the Altaic World. Proceedings of the 48th PIAC, Moscow 10-15 July, 2005*, eds. Yelena V. Boykova and Rostislav B. Rybakov, 43–54. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2006.
- Baumann, Victor Heinrich and Mănucu-Adameșteanu, Gheorghe. "Isaccea, jud. Tulcea [Noviodunum]." In *Cronica Cercetărilor Arheologice din România. Campania 2000*, eds. Mircea V. Angelescu et al., 108–10. Bucharest: CIMEC – Institutul de Memorie Culturală, 2001.
- Bazin, Louis. "À propos du nom des "Petchenègues." In *Passé turco-tatar, présent soviétique: Études offertes à Alexandre Bennigsen*, ed. Chantal Lemerrier-Quellejay et al., 67–77. Louvain/Paris: Peeters, 1986.
- Bálint, Csanád. "A honfoglalás kori lovastemetkezések néhány." *A Móra Ferenc Múzeum Évkönyve* 1 (1969): 107–14.
- Bálint, Csanád. *Die Archäologie der Steppe. Steppenvölker zwischen Volga und Donau vom 6. bis zum 10. Jahrhundert*, ed. Falko Daim. Köln: Böhlau, 1989.
- Bálint, Csanád. "Über einige Tonkessel aus der Umgebung von Sarkel." In *Die Keramik der Saltovo-Majaki Kultur und ihrer Varianten*, ed. Csanád Bálint, 9–21. Budapest: Institut für Archäologie der Ungarischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1990.

- Bálint, Csanád. "Hungarian Contributions to the Archeology." *Hungarian Studies* 12 (1997), no. 1–2: 17–26.
- Bálint, Csanád. "On 'Orient-preference' in Archaeological Research on the Avars, Proto-Bulgarians and Conquering Hungarians." In *Post-Roman Towns, Trade and Settlement in Europe and Byzantium*, vol. 1, *The Heirs of the Roman West*, ed. Joachim Henning, 545–62. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2007.
- Balogh, László. "A New Source on the Hungarian Raids against Byzantium in the Middle of the Tenth Century." *Chronica* 7–8 (2008): 16–25.
- Balogh, László. "A besenyők hitvilága és a világvallások." In *Térítés – megtérés. A világvallások terjedése Kelet-Európa népei között*, eds. László Balogh and Szilvia Kovács, 93–108. Budapest: Balassi Kiadó, 2009.
- Bănescu, Nicolae. "Paristrion, un ducat de granița bizantină în Dobrogea de astăzi." *Analele Dobrogei* 2 (1921), no. 3: 313–7.
- Bănescu, Nicolae. "Cele mai vechi știri bizantine asupra românilor de la Dunărea de Jos." *Anuarul Institutului de istorie națională din Cluj* 1 (1921–1922): 138–61.
- Bănescu, Nicolae. "La domination byzantine sur les régions du Bas-Danube." *Bulletin de la section historique de l'Académie Roumaine* 13 (1927): 10–22.
- Bănescu, Nicolae. "Ein ethnographisches Problem am Unterlauf der Dunau." *Byzantion* 6 (1931): 297–307.
- Bănescu, Nicolae. "La question du Paristrion (ou conclusion d'un long débat)." *Byzantion* 8 (1933): 277–308.
- Bănescu, Nicolae. *Bizanțul și romanitatea de la Dunărea de Jos. Discurs rostit la 25 maiu 1938 în ședință solemnă*. Bucharest: Monitorului oficial și Imprimeriei statului, Imprimerie națională, 1938.
- Bănescu, Nicolae. *Les Duchés byzantins de Paristrion (Paradounavon) et de Bulgarie*. Bucharest: Institut Roumain d'Études Byzantines, 1946.
- Beĭlis, Wolf M. "Svedeniya o Chornom more v sochineniyakh arabskikh geografov IX–X vv." In *Blizhniy i Sredniy Vostok*, ed. Avrora I. Falina, 21–8. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Vostochnoy literatury, 1962.
- Beĭlis, Wolf M. "Al-Idrisi (XII v.) o Vostochnom Prichernomor'ye i yugo-vostochnoy okraïne russkikh zemel'." In *Drevneyshiye gosudarstva na territorii SSSR (1982)*, ed. Anatoliĭ P. Novosel'tsev, 208–28. Moscow: Nauka, 1984.
- Beĭlis, Wolf M. "Krayina al-Kumaniya u 'Heohrafichnomu tvorĭ' al-Idrisi ta Polovets'ka zemlya Ipatiyivs'koho litopysu." In *Mappa Mundi: Zbirnyk naukovykh prats' na poshanu Yaroslava Dashkevycha z nahody yoho 70-richchya*, eds. Igor Gerych et al., 84–104. Lviv/Kyiv/New York: M.P. Kots, 1996.
- Bejan, Adrian and Mare, Mircea. "Dudeștii Vechi-Pusta Bucova, necropola și morminte de inhumație din secolele VI–XII." *Analele Banatului. Arheologie, istorie* 6 (1998): 323–38.

- Belitzky, János. "A nyugat-dunántúli és felvidéki besenyő telepek." In *Emlékkönyv Domanovszky Sándor születése hatvanadik fordulójának ünnepére*, 59–95. Budapest: Királyi Magyar Egyetemi Nyomda, 1937.
- Belyaev, Ivan. "O severnom berege Chernogo morya i prilozhashchikh k nemu stepyakh, do vodvoreniya v etom kraye mongolov." *ZOVID* 3 (1853): 3–46.
- Benac, Alojz. "Die Gräber in Bosnien und der Herzegovina." In *Steine der Bogomilen*, eds. Oto Bihalji-Merin and Alojz Benac, XIX–XXXIX. Wien/München: Verlag Anton Schroll, 1964.
- Berend, Nora. *At the Gate of Christendom: Jews, Muslims, and "Pagans" in Medieval Hungary, c. 1000-c. 1300*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Berend, Nora. "Forging the Cuman Law, Forging an Identity." In *Manufacturing a Past for the Present*, 109–128.
- Bibikov, Mikhail V. "Iz istorii Nizhnego Podunav'ya v X–XII vv." *Sovetskoye slavyanovedeniye* (1979), no. 1: 104–5.
- Bibikov, Mikhail V. "Istochnikovedcheskiye problemy izucheniya istorii kochevnikov v Nizhnem Podunav'ye v XII v." *RRH* (1980), no. 1: 47–52.
- Bibikov, Mikhail V. "Svedeniya Ipat'yevskoy letopisi o pechenegakh i torkakh v svete danykh vizantiyskikh istochnikov XII v." In *Letopisi i khroniki. 1980 g. (V.N. Tatishchev i izucheniye russkogo letopisaniya)*, ed. Boris A. Rybakov, 55–68. Moscow: Nauka, 1981.
- Bibikov, Mikhail V. "Bolgariya, Rus', Vizantiya, polovtsy v sisteme mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniy v Yugo-Vostochnoy Yevrope XII – pervoy poloviny XIII vv." In *Rusko-bŭlgarski vrŭzki*, 91–106.
- Bibikov, Mikhail V. *Istoricheskaya literatura Vizantii*. Saint Petersburg: Aleteya, 1998.
- Bibikov, Mikhail V. *Vizantiyskiye istochniki po istorii Drevney Rusi i Kavkaza*. Saint Petersburg: Aleteya, 1999.
- Bibikov, Mikhail V. "Kochevniki v trude Konstantina Bagryanorodnogo." *Tsivilizatsiya i varvarstvo* (2015) no. 4: 186–203.
- Bibiri, Laurentia. "Date antropologice asupra resturilor scheletice umane descoperite la Curcani-Ilfov." *SCIV* 22 (1971), no. 3: 457–62.
- Bicilli, Pētr M. "'Vostok' i 'Zapad' v istorii Starogo Sveta." In *Rossiya mezhdru Yevropoy i Aziyey*, 24–35.
- Bikić, Vesna. *Srednjovekovna keramika Beograda*. Belgrade: CICERO, 1994.
- Bisembaev, Arman A. *Arkheologicheskiye pamyatniki kochevnikov srednevekov'ya Zapadnogo Kazakhstana VIII–XVIII vv.* Oral: Zapadno-Kazakhstanskiy oblastnoy tsentr istorii i arkheologii, 2003.
- Boba, Imre. *Nomads, Northmen and Slavs. Eastern Europe in the Ninth Century*. The Hague/Wiesbaden: Mouton/Otto Harrassowitz, 1967.
- Bogdan, Damian P. "Drevneslavyanskiye grafiti, obnaruzhennyye v Dobrudzhe. Dobrudzhanskaya nadpis' 943 goda." In *IV Mezhdunarodnyy s'yezd slavistov*.

- Materialy diskussii*, vol. 2, *Problemy slavyanskogo yazykoznaniiya*, ed. Nikita I. Tolstoï, 139–40. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1962.
- Bollók, János. "A Thonuzoba-legenda Történelmi Hitele." *Századok* (1979), no. 1: 97–107.
- Bonarek, Jacek. *Romajowie i obcy w Bizancjum. Obraz europejskich grup etnicznych w "Kronice" Jana Skylitzesa*. Cracow: Adam Marszałek, 2003.
- Bonarek, Jacek "Le Bas Danube dans la seconde moitié du XIème siècle: nouveaux États ou nouveaux peuples?" In *Byzantina et Slavica Cracoviensia, vol. 5. Byzantium, New Peoples, New Powers: The Byzantino-Slav Contact Zone, from the Ninth to the Fifteenth Century*, ed. Miliana Kaimakamova et al., 193–200. Cracow: Jagiellonian University, 2007.
- Borisov, Boris. "Demografskite promeni prez XI–XII vek v dneshnite búlgarski zemi (arkheologicheski svidetelstva)." In *Tangra: Sbornik v chest na 70-godishnina na akad. Vasil Gyuzelev*, ed. Miliyana Kaïmakamova, 391–408. Sofia: Universitetsko izdatelstvo "Sv. Kliment Okhridski," 2006.
- Borisov, Boris and Sheileva, Gergana. "Arkheologicheski dannii za kúsnite nomadi na yug ot Balkana." *Pliska – Preslav* 8 (2000): 247–51.
- Boswell, Alexander B. "The Kipchak Turks." *The Slavonic Review* 6 (1927), no. 16: 68–85.
- Bozhilov, Ivan. "Les Petchénègues dans l'histoire des terres du Bas-Danube." *ÉB* 3 (1971): 170–5.
- Bozhilov, Ivan. "Búlgariya i pechenezite (896–1018)." *IstPreg* (1973), no. 2: 37–62.
- Bozhilov, Ivan. "Anonimút na Khaze." Búlgariya i Vizantiya na Dolni Dunav v kraya na X v. Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Búlgarskata akademiya na naukite, 1979.
- Bozhilov, Ivan and Gyuzelev, Vasil. *Istoriya na Dobrudzha*, vol. 2, *Srednovekovie*. Veliko Tarnovo: Faber, 2004.
- Brandenburg, Nikolai Ye. "Kakomu plemeni mogut" byt' pripisany tzh iz" yazycheskikh" mogil" Kíevskoy gubernii, v" kotorykh" vméstě s" pokoynikami pogrebeny ostovy ubitykh" loshadey." In *Trudy Desyatago Arkheologicheskago s"ezda v" Rigě, 1896*, ed. Countess Uvarova, 1–13. Moscow: Tipografiya G. Lissnera i A. Geshelya, 1899.
- Brătescu, Constantin. "Pecenegii. Pagini de istorie medievală (sec. XI) traduse din Georgios Kedrenos." *Analele Dobrogei* 5–6 (1925): 145–57.
- Brătescu, Constantin. "Dobrogea în sec. XII: Bergean, Pastrion." *Analele Dobrogei* 1 (1920), no. 1: 3–38.
- Brătianu, Gheorge Ioan. *Recherches sur Vicina et Cetatea Albă; contributions à l'histoire de la domination byzantine et tatar et du commerce génois sur le littoral roumain de la mer Noire*. Bucharest: Paul Geuthner, 1935.
- Brătianu, Gheorge Ioan. "Vicina II. Nouvelles recherches sur l'histoire et la toponymie medievale du littoral roumain de la Mer Noire. A propos des 'Miscellanies' de M.J. Bromberg." *Revue Historique du Sud-Est Européen* 19 (1942), no. 1: 133–75.
- Brockelmann, Karl. "Mahmud al-Kašghari über die Sprachen und die Stämme der Türken im 11. Jahrhundert." *KCSA* 1 (1921): 26–40.

- Brudiu, Mihalache. "Complexe funerare tumulare din sud-estul Moldovei (I)." *Peuce* 10 (1991): 41–57.
- Brudiu, Mihalache. *Lumea de sub tumulii din sudul Moldovei: De la indo-europeni la turanicii târzii. Mărturii arheologice*. Bucharest: Editura Printech, 2003.
- Bubenok, Oleg B. *Yasy i brodniki v stepyakh Vostochnoy Yevropy (VI – nachalo XIII vv.)*. Kyiv: Logos, 1997.
- Bubenok, Oleg B. "Etnichnyy sklad osiloho naseleण्या prychnomors'kykh stepiv naprykintsi X – poch. XIII st." *Ukrayina v Tsentral'no-Skhidniy Yevropi* 2 (2002): 14–37.
- Burachkov, Platon O. "Opyt izslédovaniya o Kumanakh ili Polovtsakh." *ZOOID* 10 (1877): 11–36.
- Bushakov, Valerii A. *Leksychnyy sklad istorychnoy toponimiyi Krymu*. Kyiv: Instytut skhodoznavstva im. A.Yu. Kryms'koho, 2003.
- Bustanov, Alfrid K. *Soviet Orientalism and the Creation of Central Asian Nations*. New York: Routledge, 2014.
- Chalandon, Ferdinand. *Essai sur le règne d'Alexis I-er Comnène (1081–1118)*. Paris: A. Picard et fils, 1900.
- Chalandon, Ferdinand. *Les Comnènes. Études sur l'Empire Byzantin au XI et au XII siècles*. II. *Jean II Comnène (1118–1143) et Manuel I Comnène (1143–1180)*. Paris: A. Picard et fils, 1912.
- Charanis, Peter. "Byzantium, the West and the Origin of the First Crusade." *Byzantion* 19 (1949): 17–36.
- Chebotarenko, Georgii F. "Issledovaniya na rannesrednevekovom poselenii Moleshty I." In *Arkheologicheskkiye issledovaniya v Moldavii v 1985 g.*, ed. Nikolai A. Cetraru, 229–239. Kishinev: Shtiintsa, 1990.
- Chebotarenko, Georgii F., Yarovoii, Evgenii V. and Telnov, Nikolai P. *Kurgany Budzhakskoy stepi*. Kishinev: Shtiintsa, 1989.
- Cherepanova, Yelena N. and Shchepinskiï, Askold A. "Pogrebeniya pozdnykh kochevnikov v stepnom Krymu." In *Arkheologicheskkiye issledovaniya srednevekovogo Kryma*, ed. Oleg I. Dombrovskii, 181–99. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1968.
- Cheyne, Jean-Claude. *Pouvoir et contestations à Byzance (963–1210)*. Paris: Éditions de la Sorbonne, 1990.
- Cheyne, Jean-Claude. "Par St Georges, par St Michel." *Travaux et Mémoires* (2002), no. 14: 114–34.
- Cheyne, Jean-Claude and Morrisson, Cécile. "Lieux de trouvaille et circulation des sceaux." *SBS* 2 (1990): 105–36.
- Ciggaar, Krijnie N. "Harald Hardrada: his expedition against the Pechenegs." *Balkan studies* 21 (1980): 385–401.
- Ciggaar, Krijnie N. "Flemish Mercenaries in Byzantium: Their Later History in an Old Norse Miracle." *Byzantion* 51 (1981): 44–74.

- Comşa, Eugen and Popescu, Dorin. "Cercetări arheologice pe trasul canalului Dunăre – Marea Neagră." *SCIV* 2 (1951), no. 1: 169–76.
- Comşa, Maria. "La civilisation balkano-danubienne (IXe–XIe s.) sur le territoire de la R.P. Roumaine (origine, évolution et appartenance ethnique). Étude préliminaire." *Dacia* 7 (1963): 413–38.
- Condurachi, Emil, Barnea, Ion and Diaconu, Petre. "Nouvelles recherches sur le Limes byzantin du Bas-Danube aux Xe–XIe siècles." In *Proceedings of the XIIIth International Congress*, 179–94.
- Conea, Ion and Donat, Ion. "Contribution à l'Étude de la toponymie Pétchenègue-Comane de la Plaine Roumaine du Bas-Danube." In *Contributions onomastiques publiées à l'occasion du VIe Congrès International des Sciences onomastiques à Munich du 24 au 28 août, 1958*, 139–69. Bucharest: Éditions de l'Académie de la République populaire roumaine, 1958.
- Corbu, Emilia. *Sudul României în Evul Mediu timpuriu: (secolele VIII–XI): repere arheologice* Brăila: Istros, 2006.
- Corbu, Emilia. "Historical and Archaeological Evidences about the Patzinakai's Presence to the Lower Danube." In *Kul'tury stepey Yevrazii vtoroy poloviny I tysyachetiyu n.e. Tezisy dokladov IV Mezhdunarodnoy arheologicheskoy konferentsii*, 45–7. Samara: Samarskiy oblastnoy istoriko-krayevedcheskiy muzey im. P.V. Alabina, 2008.
- Cossuto, Giuseppe. "Les 'nomades primitifs' et le croisé normand: les Petchenègues 'byzantins' et Bohemond de Tarante." *Studia et Documenta Turcologica* 2 (2014): 45–53.
- Cresci, Lia R. "Michele Attaliata e gli ἔθνη scitici." *Néa 'Róme* (2004), no. 1: 185–207.
- Curta, Florin. *Southeastern Europe in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Curta, Florin. "The Image and Archaeology of the Pechenegs." *Banatica* 23 (2013): 143–202. In Russian: "Образ и археология печенегов." *Stratum plus* 5 (2013): 203–34.
- Curta, Florin. *Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages (500–1300)*, 2 vols. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2019.
- Czebe, Gyula. "Turco-byzantinische Miscellen (I)." *KCsA* 3 (1922): 209–19; "Turco-byzantinische Miscellen (II)." *KCsA* 4 (1924): 306–10.
- Czeglédý, Károly. "A kunok eredetéről." *Magyar Nyelv* 45 (1949): 43–50.
- Czeglédý, Károly. "Új adat a besenyők történetéhez." *Magyar Nyelv* 46 (1950): 361–2.
- Czeglédý, Károly. *IV–IX századi nepmozgalmak a steppén*. Budapest, 1954.
- Czeglédý, Károly. "From East to West: The Age of Nomadic Migrations in Europe." *AEMAE* 3 (1983): 25–126.
- Damian, Oana. "Despre prezența politică bizantină la Dunărea de Jos în secolele VII–X." In *Prinos lui Petre Diaconu*, 283–318.



- Danilevskii, Igor' N. *Povest' vremennykh let: Germenevticheskiye osnovy izucheniya letopisnykh tekstov*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Olega Abyshko, 2004.
- Dashkevych, Yaroslav R. and Tryjarski, Edward. *Kamennyye baby Prichernomorskikh stepey. Kolleksiya iz Askanii-Nova*. Wrocław/Warsaw/Cracow: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1982.
- Daskalov, Roumen. "Feud over the Middle Ages: Bulgarian-Romanian Historiographical Debates." In *Entangled Histories of the Balkans*, 274–354.
- Dawkins, Richard M. "An Echo in the Norse Sagas of the Patzinak War of John Komninos." *Mélanges E. Boisacq (Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves)* 5 (1937): 243–9.
- Degtyarëv, Alexandr Ya. and Dubov Igor' V. *Ot Kalki do Ugry*. Leningrad: Detskaya literatura, 1986.
- Demchenko, Tetiana I. and Chebotarenko, Georgii F. "Pogrebeniya kochevnikov v kurganakh Nizhnego Podnestrov'ya." In *Srednevekovyye pamyatniki Dnestrovsko-Prutskogo mezhdurech'ya*, ed. Pavel Byrnâ, 95–105. Kishinev: Shtiintsa, 1988.
- Diaconu, Petre. "Cu privire la problema căldărilor de lut în epoca feudală timpurie (sec. X–XIII)." *SCIV* 7 (1956), no. 3–4: 421–39.
- Diaconu, Petre. "K voprosu o glinyanykh kotlakh na territorii RNR." *Dacia* 8 (1964): 249–64.
- Diaconu, Petre. "Despre pecenegii la Dunărea de Jos în secolul al X-lea." *SRdI* (1965), no. 5: 117–29.
- Diaconu, Petre. "Les Petchénègues du Bas-Danube au Xe siècle." *Dacia* 11 (1967): 259–70.
- Diaconu, Petre. "Despre pecenegii la Dunărea de Jos în prima jumătate a secolului al XI-lea." *SCIV* 18 (1967), no. 3: 463–76.
- Diaconu, Petre. *Les Petchénègues au Bas-Danube*. Bucharest: Éditions de l'Académie de la République socialiste de Roumanie, 1970.
- Diaconu, Petre. "The Petchenegs on the Lower Danube." In *Relations between the Autochthonous Population*, 235–40.
- Diaconu, Petre. *Les Coumans au Bas-Danube aux XI et XII siècles*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1978.
- Diaconu, Petre. "A propos de l'invasion cumane de 1148." *ÉByz* 1 (1979): 19–27.
- Diaconu, Petre. "Realități politice la Dunărea de Jos: Români, bizantini, bulgari, pecenegi." *RdI* (1981), no. 6: 111–33.
- Diaconu, Petre and Vîlceanu, Dumitru. *Păciiul lui Soare*, vol. 1, *Cetatea bizantină*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1972.
- Dieter, Karl. "Zur Glaubwürdigkeit der Anna Komnena. Der Petschenegenkrieg 1084–1091." *BZ* 3 (1894): 386–90.
- Dieterich, Karl. *Byzantinische Quellen zur Länder- und Völkerkunde 5.–15. Jahrhundert. 2. Das Gebiet der neueren Wandervölker*. Leipzig: Wigand, 1912.

- Dimitrov, Dimitür. "Nomadska keramika v Severoiztochna Bŭlgariya." *INMV* 11 (1975): 37–58.
- Dimitrov, Khristo. *Bŭlgarsko-ungarski odnosheniya prez srednovkovieto. Istoricheski izsledvaniya*. Sofia: Akademichno izdatelstvo "Prof. Marin Drinov," 1998.
- Dimitrov, Khristo. *Bŭlgariya i nomadite do nachaloto na XI v.* Plovdiv: Fondatsiya Bŭlgarsko istoricheskoto nasledstvo, 2011.
- Dimitrov, Khristo and Iliev, Iliya. "'Ungarskata khronika' na ŭoan Turotsi ot XV v kato izvor za srednovkovnata istoriya na Bŭlgariya." *IstPreg* (1988), no. 6: 75–88.
- Dobrodomov, Igor' G. "O polovetskikh etnonimakh v drevnerusskoy literature." In *Tyurkologicheskiy sbornik* (1975), ed. Andrei N. Kononov, 102–29. Moscow: Nauka, 1978.
- Dobrolyubskii, Andrii O. "Ob arkeologicheskom izuchenii srednevekov'ya v Moldavii." *Arkeologicheskiye issledovaniya*, 189–98.
- Dobrolyubskii, Andrii O. *Kochevniki Severo-Zapadnogo Prichernomor'ya v epokhu srednevekov'ya*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986.
- Dobrolyubskii, Andrii O. *Kochovyky Pivdenno-Zakhidnoyi Ukrayiny v X–XVII stolittiyakh*. Mykolaiv: Ilion, 2011.
- Dobrolyubskii, Andrii O. *Odesseya odnogo arkeologa*. Kyiv, 2013.
- Dobrolyubskii, Andrii O. and Dzigovskiĭ, Oleksandr M. "Pamyatniki kochevnikov IX–XIV vv. na zapade prichernomorskikh stepey (materialy k arkeologicheskoy karte)." In *Pamyatniki drevnikh kul'tur Severo-Zapadnogo Prichernomor'ya*, ed. Petro O. Karyshkovskii, 134–44. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1981.
- Doncheva-Petkova, Lydmila. "Srednovkovni glineni sŭdove s vŭtreshni ushi." *Arkeologiya* (1974), no. 4: 32–8.
- Doncheva-Petkova, Lydmila. "Nekropol pri yuzhniya sektor na zapadnata krepostna stena na Pliska." In *Sbornik v pамет na prof. Stancho Vakiĭnov*, ed. Vasil. Gyuzelev, 181–91. Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bŭlgarskata akademiya na naukite, 1984.
- Doncheva-Petkova, Lydmila. "Pamyatniki rannego srednevekov'ya v Yuzhnoy Dobrudzhe." In *Trudy V Mezhdunarodnogo kongressa arkeologov-slavistov*, vol. 2, eds. Boris A. Rybakov et al., 238–43. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1988.
- Doncheva-Petkova, Lydmila. "Srednovkovnen nekropol pri selo Odŭrtsi, Dobrichko (predvaritelno sŭobshtenie)." *Dobrudzha* 10 (1993): 134–44.
- Doncheva-Petkova, Lydmila. "Adornments from a 11th Century Pecheneg's Necropolis by Odartsı Village, Dobrich District (North-Eastern Bulgaria)." *AB* 2 (1998), no. 3: 126–38.
- Doncheva-Petkova, Lydmila. "Pliska i pechenezite." *Pliska-Preslav* 9 (2003), 244–58.
- Doncheva-Petkova, Lydmila. *Odŭrtsi*, 2.
- Doncheva-Petkova, Lydmila. "Zur ethnischen Zugehörigkeit einiger Nekropolen des 11. Jahrhunderts in Bulgarien." In *Post-Roman Towns, Trade and Settlement in Europe*

- and *Byzantium*, vol. 2, *Byzantium, Pliska and the Balkans*, ed. Joachim Henning, 643–60. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2007.
- Drăganu, Nicolae. *Românii în veacurile IX–XIV pe baza toponimiei și a onomasticeii*. Bucharest: Monitorul oficial și Imprimeriile statului, 1933.
- Dragoman, Radu-Alexandru and Oanță-Marghitu, Sorin. “Archaeology in Communist and Post-Communist Romania.” *Dacia* 50 (2006): 57–76.
- Druzhynina, Inga A., Chkhaidze, Victor N. and Narozhnyi, Yevgenii I. *Srednevekovyye kochevniki v vostochnom Priazov'ye*. Armavir: Slavyanka, 2011.
- Dudek, Jarosław. “Pieczęć magistra Jana Kegena jako wyraz polityki Bizancjum wobec stepowców w połowie XI w.” *Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis. Historia* 171 (2005): 327–43.
- Dučhev, Ivan. “Prouchvaniya vŭrkhu bŭlgarskoto srednevekovie.” *Sbornik na Bŭlgarskata Akademiya na naukite* 41 (1945), no. 1: 1–176.
- Dzhanov, Olexasndr V. and Mayko, Vadym V. “Vizantiya i kochevniki v Yugo-Vostochnoy Tavrike v XI–XIII vv.” *Khersonesskyy sbornyk* 9 (1998): 160–81.
- Ecsedy, Ildikó. “Nomads in History and Historical Research.” *Acta Orientalia ASH* 35 (1981), no. 2–3: 201–27.
- Ecsedy, Ildikó. “Nomad Societies and State Formations.” *Acta Orientalia ASH* 35 (1981), no. 2–3: 393–6.
- Erdélyi, István. “Résultats des recherches archéologiques relatives aux trouvailles des cavaliers nomads orientaux en Hongrie (1953–1964).” *Acta Orientalis ASH* 18 (1965), no. 3: 373–8.
- Erdélyi, István. “Vengry na Donu.” In *Mayatskoye gorodishche. Trudy sovetsko-bolgaro-vengerskoy ekspeditsii*, ed. Svetlana A. Pletnyova, 20–5. Moscow: Nauka, 1984.
- Erdélyi, István. “O pechenegakh na territorii Vengrii: k postanovke voprosa.” In *Materialy I tys. n.e. po arkeologii i istorii Ukrainy i Vengrii*, ed. Oleg M. Pryhodniuk, 163–6. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1996.
- Erdélyi, István. *Őseink nyomában. A magyar őstörténet kutatása a XX. században*. Budapest: Masszi Kiadó, 2004.
- Erzi, Adnan D. “Türkiye Kütüphanelerinden notlar ve vesikalar.” *Türk Tarih Kurumu, Belleten* 14 (1950): 85–105, 595–647.
- Fehér, Géza. “Die Petschenegen und die ungarischen Hunnensagen.” *KCsA* 2 (1921): 123–40.
- Fehér, Géza. *Bulgarisch-Ungarische Beziehungen in den V–XI Jahrhunderten*. Budapest: Nyomatott Taizs József könyvnyomdájában, 1921.
- Fehér, Géza. “Zur Geschichte der Steppenvölker von Südrussland im 9–10. Jahrhundert.” *Studia Slavica ASH* 5 (1959), no. 3–4: 257–326.
- Fejér, György. *A kunok eredete*. Pest: Edelmann K., 1850.
- Ferent, Ioan. *Cumani și Episcopia lor*. Blaj: Tipografia Seminarului Teologic gr.-catolic, 1931.

- Ferluga, Jadran. "Die Adressenliste für auswärtige Herrscher aus dem Zeremonienbuch Konstantin Porphyrogenetos." *ZRVI* 12 (1970), 157–78.
- Ferluga, Jadran. "Quelques problèmes de politique byzantine de colonisation au XIe siècle dans les Balkans." *BF* 7 (1979): 37–56.
- Ferrari d'Occhieppo, Konradin. "Zur Identifizierung der Sonnenfinsternis während des Petschenegenkrieges Alexios' I. Komnenos (1084)." *JÖB* 23 (1974): 179–84.
- Fiedler, Uwe. "Bulgars in the Lower Danube Region. A Survey of the Archaeological Evidence and of the State of Current Research." In *The Other Europe*, 151–236.
- Fiedler, Uwe. "Zur Suche nach dem archäologischen Niederschlag von Petschenegen, Uzen und Kumanen in den Gebieten südlich der unteren Donau." In *The Steppe Lands and the World beyond Them*, 249–86.
- Fine, John V.A. *The Early Medieval Balkans: A Critical Survey from the Sixth to the Late Twelfth Century*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1983.
- Florescu, Grigore. "Capidava în epoca migrațiilor." *RIR* 16 (1946): 325–43.
- Florescu, Grigore, Florescu, Radu and Diaconu, Petre. *Capidava: Monografie arheologică*, vol. 1. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Române, 1958.
- Fodor, István. *Die große Wanderung der Ungarn vom Ural nach Pannonien*. Budapest: Corvina Kiadó, 1982.
- Franklin, Simon and Shepard, Jonathan. *The Emergence of Rus 750–1200*. London/New York: Longman, 1996.
- Frankopan, Peter. "The Numismatic Evidence from the Danube Region 971–1092." *BMGS* 21 (1997): 30–9.
- Frankopan, Peter. "Unravelling the Alexiad: Who was 'Devgenevich' of the Russian Primary Chronicle and 'Pseudo-Diogenes' of the Greek sources?" *BMGS* 29 (2005), no. 2: 147–66.
- Fyodorov, Georgii B., Chebotarenko, Georgii F. and Velikanova, Marina S. *Braneshitskiy mogil'nik X–XI vv.* Kishinev: Shtiintsa, 1984.
- Fyodorov-Davydov, German A. *Kochevniki Vostochnoy Yevropy pod vlast'yu zolotoordynskikh khanov. Arkheologicheskiye pamyatniki*. Moscow: Izdaniye Moskovskogo universiteta, 1966.
- Fyodorov-Davydov, German A. "On the Dating of Types of Artifacts from Burial Assemblages." *Soviet Anthropology and Archaeology* 5 (1966), no. 2: 22–34.
- Gagova, Krasimira. *Trakiya prez bulgarskoto srednovekovie (istoricheska geografija)*. Sofia: Universitetsko izdatelstvo "Sv. Kliment Okhridski," 1995.
- Galamb, György. "Megjegyzések Querfurti Brúnó besenyők közötti térítési kísérletéhez." In *A Kárpát-medence és a steppe*, ed. Alfréd Márton, 181–85. Budapest: Balassi Kiadó, 2001.
- Gáll, Erwin. "The Archaeological Research State of the 9/10–11th Centuries in Moldova (Romania). Some Thoughts on Funerary Places and Stray Finds (Axes)." *Ziridava. Studia Archaeologica* 29 (2015): 313–32.

- Garustovich, Gennadii N. "Rasprostraneniye islama u pechenegov v stepyakh Vostochnoy Evropy." *Vestnik Akademii nauk Respubliki Bashkortostan* 18 (2013), no. 3: 66–75.
- Garustovich, Gennadii N. "Proniknoveniye khristianstva k tyurkoyazychnym kochevnikam – pechenegam v epokhu srednevekov'ya." *Problemy vostokovedeniya* 59 (2013), no. 1: 32–8.
- Garustovich, Gennadii N. and Ivanov, Vladimir A. *Materialy po arkheologii srednevekovykh kochevnikov Yuzhnogo Urala (IX–XV vv. n.e.)*. Ufa: Bashkirskiy gosudarstvennyy pedagogicheskiy universitet im. M. Akmully, 2014.
- Gautier, Paul. "Le dossier d'un haut fonctionnaire byzantin d'Alexis I-er Comnène, Manuel Straboromanos." *RÉB* 23 (1965): 168–204.
- Gautier, Paul. "Diatribes de Jean l'Oxite contre Alexis Ier Comnène." *RÉB* 28 (1970): 5–55.
- Gautier, Paul. "Le synode des Blachernes (fin 1094). Etude prosopographique." *RÉB* 29 (1971): 213–84.
- Gautier, Paul. "Réquisitoire du patriarche Jean d'Antioche contre le charisticariat." *RÉB* 33 (1975): 77–132.
- Gavrilina, Larisa M. "Kochevniicheskiye ukrasheniya X veka." *SovArkh* (1985), no. 3: 220–24.
- Gavrilina, Larisa M. *Prikladnoye iskusstvo kochevnikov Vostochnoy Yevropy X–XIV vekov* [Candidate's thesis]. Moscow, 1986.
- Gavrilov, Alexandr V. "Srednevekovyye pamyatniki Yugo-Vostochnogo Kryma (materialy k arkheologicheskoy karte)." *Sugdeyskiy sbornik*, 3, eds. Nelya M. Kukoval's'ka et al., 331–84. Kyiv/Sudak: Akadempriodyka, 2008.
- Gening, Volodymyr F. *Ocherki istorii sovetskoy arkheologii. (U istokov formirovaniya marksistskikh teoreticheskikh osnov sovetskoy arkheologii. 20-ye – pervaya polovina 30-kh godov)*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1982.
- Geras'kova, Lyubov S. *Skul'ptura seredn'ovichnykh kochovykiv stepiv Skhidnoyi Yevropy*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1991.
- Gerics, József. "Quaedam puella de genere Tatum. Philologisches und Rechtsgeschichtliches zur Untersuchung einer Chronikenstelle." *Annales Universitatis Scientiarum Budapestinensis de Rolando Eötvös nominatae. Sectio Historica* 9 (1967): 3–30.
- Gheorghel, Ilie. "Cercetări privitoare la nomenclatura comanilor [part 1–2]." *Revista Tinerimea Română* (1899): 263–4; (1900): 387–8; [part 3–4] *Revista Arhiva* (1905): 357–9; (1910): 124–6; [part 5–7] *Revista pentru Istorie, Arheologie și Filologie* 16 (1915–1922): 187–94.
- Gilis, Odysseas. *Tourkia, Tourkiká, Tourkoi, Mousoulmánoi, Islám, Moamethanoí, Cházaroi, Tourkománoi*. Thessaloniki, 2015.
- Ginsburg, Wulf V. "Antropologicheskiy sostav naseleniya Sarkela – Beloy Vezhi i yego proiskhozhdeniye." In *TVDAE*, 3, 261–81.

- Göckenjan, Hansgerd. *Hilfsvölker und Grenzwächter im mittelalterlichen Ungarn*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1972.
- Göckenjan, Hansgerd. "Zur Stammesstruktur und Heeresorganisation altaischer Völker." In *Europa Slavica – Europa Orientalis. Festschrift für Herbert Ludat zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Klaus-Detlev Grothusen and Klaus Zernack, 51–86. Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1980.
- Göckenjan, Hansgerd. "Die Welt der frühen Reitervölker." In *Die Mongolen und ihr Weltreich*, ed. Arne Z. Eggebrecht, 7–43. Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern in Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1989.
- Göckenjan, Hansgerd. "Kundschafter und Späher. Ein Beitrag zur Strategie und Taktik reiternomadischer Kriegsführung." *Acta Orientalia ASH* 53 (2000), no. 3–4: 187–202.
- Göckenjan, Hansgerd and Zimonyi, István. *Orientalische Berichte über die Völker Osteuropas und Zentralasiens im Mittelalter: die Ġayhani-Tradition (Ibn Rusta, Gardizī, Ĥudūd-al-Ālam, al-Bakrī und al-Marwazī)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag in Kommission, 2001.
- Golden, Peter B. "The Migrations of the Oğuz." *Archivum Ottomanicum* 4 (1972): 45–84.
- Golden, Peter B. "The Polovci Dikii." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 3/4 (1979): 296–309.
- Golden, Peter B. "Imperial Ideology and the Sources of Political Unity amongst the pre-Činggisid Nomads of Western Eurasia." *AEMAE* 2 (1982): 37–76.
- Golden, Peter B. "Nomads and Their Sedentary Neighbors in pre-Činggisid Eurasia." *AEMAE* 7 (1987–1991): 41–81.
- Golden, Peter B. "Peoples of the South-Russian Steppes." In *The Cambridge History of Early Inner Asia*, vol. 1, ed. Denis Sinor, 256–84. Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press 1990.
- Golden, Peter B. "The Qipčaq of Medieval Eurasia: An Example of Stateless Adaptation in the Steppes." In *Rulers from the Steppe: State Formation on the Eurasian Periphery*, ed. Gary Seaman and Daniel Marks, 132–57. Los Angeles: Ethnographics Press, Center for Visual Anthropology, 1991.
- Golden, Peter B. "Aspects of the Nomadic Factor in the Economic Development of Kievan Rus." In *Ukrainian Economic History. Interpretive Essays*, ed. Ivan S. Koropeckyj, 58–101. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1991.
- Golden, Peter B. "Pečenegs." In *Encyclopaedia of Islam. N.E.*, vol. 8, eds. C.E. Bosworth et al., 289–91. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Golden, Peter B. "Nomads in the Sedentary World: The Case of the pre-Chinggisid Rus' and Georgia." In *Nomads in the Sedentary World*, eds. Anatolii M. Khazanov and Andre Wink, 24–75. Richmond: Routledge, 2001.
- Golden, Peter B. "Khazar Studies: Achievements and Perspectives." In *The World of the Khazars*, 7–57.
- Golden, Peter B. "The Turkic World in Mahmūd al-Kāshgharī." In *Complexity of Inter Action along the Eurasian Steppe Zone in the First Millennium CE*, ed. Jan. Bemmann and Michael Schmauder, 503–55. Bonn: VFG-Arch Press, 2015.

- Golev, Konstantin. *Prichini za kumanskite migratsii na Balkanite* [Ph.D. thesis]. Sofia, 2013.
- Golev, Konstantin. "The Cuman-Qipchaqs and Crimea: The Role of the Peninsula in the Nomads' Relations with the Outside World." *AEMAE* 24 (2018): 23–107.
- Golubovskii, Petro V. "Ob uzakh i torkakh." *ZhMNP* 234 (1884), no. 7: 1–21.
- Golubovskii, Petro V. *Pechenegi, torki i polovtsy do nashestviya tatar. Istorīya yuzh-norusskikh stepey IX–XIII vv. IX–XIII 86*. Kyiv: Universitetskaya tipografiya I.I. Zavadskogo, 1884.
- Golubovskii, Petro V. "Polovtsy v Vengrii (Istoricheskiy ocherk)." *Universitetskie izvestiya* (1889), no. 12: 45–72.
- Gombocz, Zoltan. "Über den Volksnamen besenyő." *Túrán* 3 (1918), no. 4: 209–15.
- Gorodtsov, Vasilii. "Rezultaty arkheologicheskikh issledovaniy v Izyumskom" uēzde Khar'kovskoy gubernii 1901 goda." In *Trudy Dvenadtsatogo Arkheologicheskago s'ezda v Khar'kově, 1902 g.*, vol. 1, ed. Countess Uvarova, 213–5. Moscow: Tovarishchestvo tipografii A.I. Mamontova, 1905.
- Grămadă, Nicolae. "Vicina: Izvoare cartografice. Originea numelui. Identificarea oraşului." In *Codrul Cosminului. Buletinul Institutului de Istorie și Limbă* 1 (1924): 437–59.
- Grămadă, Nicolae. "Ozolimna." *Codrul Cosminului. Buletinul Institutului de Istorie și Limbă* 2–3 (1925–1926): 85–97.
- Greco, Alexandru [Petre P. Panaitescu], "Bulgaria în Nordul Dunări în veacurile al IX–X-lea." *SCIM* 1 (1950): 223–36.
- Grégoire, Henri. "Le nom des Hongrois." *Byzantion* 12 (1937): 645–50.
- Grégoire, Henri. "Byzance, les Khazars, les Magyars et les Petchénègues." In *Sixième Congrès International d'Études Byzantines, Alger 2–7 Octobre 1939. Résumés des rapports et communications*, 6–7. Paris: Comité d'organisation du Congrès, 1940.
- Grekov, Boris D. "Istorīya drevnikh slavyan i Rusi v rabotakh akad. V.G. Vasil'yevskogo." *VDI* (1939), no. 1: 338–51.
- Grekov, Boris D. *Kiyevskaya Rus'*. Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoye izdatel'stvo politicheskoy literatury, 1953.
- Grigor'yev, Vasilii V. "Ob otnosheniyakh mezhdru kochevymi narodami i osedlymi gosudarstvami." *ZhMNP* 178 (1875), no. 3: 1–27.
- Gumilyov, Lev N. *Drevnyaya Rus' i Velikaya Step'*. Moscow: AST, 1989.
- Gumilyov, Lev N. *Tysyacheletīye vokrug Kaspiya*. Baku: Azernesh, 1991.
- Gumilyov, Lev N. and Erdélyi, István. "Yedinstvo i raznoobraziye stepnoy kul'tury Yevrazii v sredniye veka." *Narody Azii i Afriki* (1969), no. 3: 78–87.
- Guseinov, Rauf A. "Siriyskiye istochniki po istorii Vizantii XI–XII vv." *VizVrem* 33 (1972): 120–8.
- Guseinov, Rauf A. "Tyurkskiye etnicheskiye gruppy XI–XII vv. v Zakavkaz'ye." In *Tyurkologicheskii sbornik* (1972), eds. Andrei N. Kononov et al., 375–81. Moscow: Nauka, 1973.

- Gyárfás, István. *A Jász-Kúnok Története*, 4 vols. Kecskemét/Szolnok/Budapest: Nyomatott Szilády Károlynál, 1870–1885.
- Gyóny, Mátyás. *Magyarország és a Magyarság a Bizánci források tükrében: Ungarn und das Ungarum im Spiegel der Byzantinischen Quellen*. Budapest: Pázmány Péter Tudományegyetem, Görög Filológiai Intézet, 1938.
- Gyóny, Mátyás. "Zur Frage der rumänischen Staatsbildungen im XI. Jahrhundert in Paristrion (Archaisierende Volksnamen und ethnische Wirklichkeit in der 'Alexias' von Anna Komnene)." *AECO* 9–10 (1943–1944): 83–188.
- Gyóny, Mátyás. "Les variantes d'un type de légende byzantine dans la littérature ancienne-islamique." *Acta Antiqua ASH* 4 (1956), no. 1–4: 293–313.
- Györffy, György. "Besenyők és magyarok." *KCSA* 5 (1940): 397–500. 2nd edition in *A magyarság keleti elemei*, 94–191. Budapest: Gondolat, 1990.
- Györffy, György. *Az Árpád-kori Magyarország történeti földrajza. Geographia historica Hungariae tempore stirpis Arpadianae*, 4 vols. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1963–1998.
- Györffy, György. "Monuments du lexique Petchénègue." *Acta Orientalia ASH* 18 (1965), no. 1–2: 73–81.
- Györffy, György. "Sur la question de l'établissement des Petchénègues en Europe." *Acta Orientalia ASH* 25 (1972): 283–92.
- Györffy, György. "Système des residences d'hiver et d'été chez les nomads et les chefs hongrois du Xe siècle." *AEMAE* 1 (1975): 45–154.
- Györffy, György. "Landnahme, Ansiedlung und Streifzüge der Ungarn." *Acta Historica ASH* 31 (1985), no. 3–4: 231–70.
- Györffy, György and Zólyomi, Bálint. "A Kárpát-medence és Etelköz képe egy évezred előtt." *Magyar tudomány: a Magyar Tudományos Akadémia értesítője* 41 (1996): 899–918.
- Gyuzelev, Vasil. "Dobrudzhanskiyat nadpis i sübitiyata v Bülğariya prez 943 g." *IstPreg* (1968), no. 6: 40–48.
- Gyuzelev, Vasil. *Srednovekovna Bülğariya v svetlinata na novi izvori*. Sofia: Narodna prosveta, 1981.
- Habovštiak, Alojz. "Príspevok k poznaniu našej nížinnej dediny v XI–XIII. Storoči." *Slovenská Archeológia* 9 (1961), no. 1–2: 451–82.
- Hâncu, Ivan G. *Kepreriya – pamyatnik kul'tury X–XII vv*. Kishinev: Shtiintsa, 1973.
- Harmatta, János. "Byzantium and the Ancient Hungarians: The Life-Work of Gyula Moravcsik." In *Byzance et ses voisins: Mélanges à la mémoire de Gyula Moravcsik à l'occasion du centième anniversaire de sa naissance*, ed. Terézia Olajos, 7–10. Szeged: Generalia, 1994.
- Hatházi, Gábor. "Az Árpád-kori magyar hadszervezet nomád elemeinek kérdéséhez: A besenyők." *Hadtörténeti Közlemények* 103 (1990), no. 2: 22–60.
- Hatházi, Gábor. "Besenyők és kunok a Mezőföldön." *Zúduló sasok*, 37–56.



- Hatházi, Gábor. "A besenyő megtelepedés régészeti nyomai Fejér megyében." *Savaria: a Vas megyei múzeumok értesítője* 22/3 (1996): 223–48.
- Herényi, István. "A kabarok, székelyek és besenyők szerepe a nyugati végek védelmében és benépesítésében." *Forrás* 24 (1992), no. 8: 68–76.
- Horváth, Ferenc and Hatházi, Gábor. "Pechenegi i kuny. Arkheologicheskoye naslediyе." In *Tyurkskiye kochevniki v Azii i Yevrope*, 7–87.
- Horváth, Péter. *Commentatio de initiis, ac maioribus Iazygum et Cumanorum eorumque constitutionibus, a Petro Horvath ex probatis scriptoribus et authenticis documentis depromta*. Pestinum: Matthiae Trattner, 1801.
- Hotnog, Titus. *Câteva nume topice românești de origine cumană*. Iași, 1933.
- Howard-Johnston, James. "The De Administrando Imperio: A Re-Examination of the Text and a Re-Evaluation of Its Evidence about the Rus." In *Les Centres proto-urbains russes entre Scandinavie, Byzance et Orient: Actes du Colloque Int. tenu au Collège de France en octobre 1997*, eds. Michel Kazanski et al., 301–36. Paris: P. Lethielleux, 2000.
- Howard-Johnston, James. "Byzantium, Bulgaria and the Peoples of Ukraine in the 890s." *MAIET* 7 (2000): 342–56.
- Howard-Johnston, James. "Byzantine Sources for Khazar History." In *The World of the Khazars*, 163–94.
- Huxley, George. "Steppe-Peoples in Konstantinos Porphyrogenetos." *JÖB* 34 (1984): 77–89.
- Iliescu, Octavian. "Premières apparitions au Bas-Danube de la monnaie reformée d'Alexis I-er Comnène." *ÉByz* 1 (1979): 9–18.
- Ioniță, Adrian. "Morminte de călăreți la nordul Dunării de Jos în sec. X–XIII." In *Prinos lui Petre Diaconu*, 462–88.
- Ioniță, Adrian. "Structures de pouvoir et populations au Nord du Danube aux Xe–XIIIe siècles reflétées par les découvertes funéraires (Etat actuelle de la recherche et intentions du projet)." *Transylvanian Review* 19 (2010), Suppl. 5/1, 115–34.
- Ioniță, Adrian. "Observations sur les necropoles planes dans la region comprise entre le Bas-Danube, les Carpates et le Dniestr aux Xe–XIIIe siecles." *Banatica* 23 (2013): 203–22.
- Ioniță, Adrian. "Observații asupra mormintelor cu depunere de cai sau părți de cai în spațiul cuprins între Dunărea de Jos, Carpați și Nistru, în secolele X–XIII." In *The Steppe Lands and the World beyond Them*, 115–50.
- Їordanov, Ivan. "Monetnata reforma na Aleksii I Komnin (1081–1118) v svetlinata na numizmaticheski nakhodki ot Iztochna Bŭlgariya." *Arkheologiya* (1978), no. 1: 7–12.
- Їordanov, Ivan. "Sceau d'archonte de PATZINAKIA du XIe siècle." *ÉB* 28 (1992), no. 2: 79–82.
- Їordanov, Ivan. "Pechati na Їoan Kegen, magistŭr i arkhont na Pechenegiya (1050–1051)." *Numizmatika i sfragistika* (1998), no. 1–2: 96–102.

- Īordanov, Ivan. "Pechati deyateley iz 'Aleksiady', naydennyye v Veliki-Preslave." *Vestnik VolGU. Istoriya. Regionovedeniye. Mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya* 21 (2016): 19–31.
- Īordanov, Ivan. "Bitkata pri Akheloi prez 917 g.: Chislenost i sŭstav na vizantiiskata armiya. Prosopografiya na uchastnitsite (Prinosŭt na sfragistikata)." In *Simeonova Bŭlgariya*, 33–60.
- Īordanov, Ivan and Dimitrova, Branimira. "Danni ot antropologichnoto izsledvane na pogrebanite v srednovkovniya nekropol № 2 pri s. Odŭrtsi, Dobrichko, XI v." In *Odiŭrtsi*, 2, 415–60.
- Iorga, Nicolae. "Les premières cristallisations d'État des Roumains." *Bulletin de la Section Historique de l'Académie Roumaine* 5–8 (1920): 33–46.
- Iorga, Nicolae. "Imperiul Cumanilor ŝi domnia lui Băsarabă. Un capitol din colaboraŭia româno-barbară în Evul Mediu." *Analele Academiei Române: Memoriile Secŭiunii Istorice* 3 (1928), no. 8: 97–103.
- Istvánovits, Márton. "Georgian Data Bearing on the Pechenegs." *Acta Orientalia ASH* 16 (1963), no. 3: 319–23.
- Ivaniŝević, Vujadin. "Opticaj vizantijskih folisa XI veka na prostoru Centralnog Balkana." *Numizmatičar* 16 (1993): 79–92.
- Ivanov, Rumen. "Pechenezhki nashestviya v yuzhnobŭlgarskite zemi (po arkeologicheski danni ot nekropola pri s. Iskra, obsht. Pŭrvomaĭ)." *Zhurnal za istoricheski i arkeologicheski izsledvaniya* (2014), no. 1–2: 45–51.
- Ivanov, Rumen. "Novi danni za pechenegite v Yuzhna Bŭlgariya." *Dobrudzha* 30 (2015): 401–9.
- Ivanov, Rumen and Ivanov, Rosen. *Pogrebalni obredi na pechenezi i kumani po bŭlgarskite zemi (XI–XIII v.)*. Plovdiv: Imeon, 2015.
- Ivanov, Rumen, Ivanov, Rosen and Tomov, Georgi. *Srednovekoven nomadski nekropol ot Plovdiv (XI–XIII v.)*. Plovdiv: Studio 18, 2016.
- Ivanov, Sergeĭ A. "Vizantiysko-bolgarskiye otnosheniya v 966–969 gg." *VizVrem* 42 (1981): 88–100.
- Ivanov, Sergeĭ A. "Missiya vostochnokhristianskoy tserkvi k slavyanam i kochevnikam: evolyutsiya metodov." *Slavyane i ikh sosedi*. Issue. 10. *Slavyane i kochevoy mir*, ed. Boris N. Florya, 16–39. Moscow: Nauka, 2001.
- Ivanov, Vladimir A. "Plemena konfederatsii kipchakov/polovtsev v Vostochnoy Yevrope po dannym pis'mennykh istochnikov i arkeologii." In *Tyurkologicheskiy sbornik, 2013–2014: Pamyati Sergeya Grigor'evich Klyashtornogo*, eds. Tatyana D. Skrynnikova et al., 94–103. Moscow: Nauka, 2016.
- Ivanov, Vladimir A. and Krieger, Vladimir A. *Kurgany kypchakskogo vremeni na Yuzhnom Urale (XII–XIV vv.)*. Moscow: Nauka, 1988.
- Ivanov, Vladimir A., Garustovich, Gennadiĭ N. and Pylypchuk, Yaroslav V. *Srednevekovyye kochevniki na granitse Yevropy i Azii*. Ufa: Bashkirskiy gosudarstvennyy pedagogicheskiy universitet im. M. Akmully, 2014.

- Īotov, Valeri. "O material'noy kul'ture pechenegov k yugu ot Dunaya – listovidnyye azhurnyye amulety XI v." *Stratum plus* (2000), no. 5: 209–12.
- Īotov, Valeri. *Vūorūzhenieto i snaryazhenieto ot būlgarskoto srednevekovie (VII–XI v.)*. Varna: Zograf, 2004.
- Īotov, Valeri. "Rannyya ili prabolgarskaya kul'tura. Chto nuzhno otmenit', chto mozžno dobavit'." In *Bolgarskiy Forum I. Materialy Mezhdunarodnogo Bolgarskogo Foruma (19–21 iyunya 2010 g., Bolgar)*, eds. Rafael S. Khakimov et al., 109–18. Kazan: 000 "Foliant"; Institut istorii im. Sh. Mardzhani AN RT, 2011.
- Īotov, Valeri. "Mechi Vizantii i sabli kochevnikov (VIII–XII vv.) na Nizhnem Dunaye." In *Istochniki po istorii kochevnikov*, 50–2.
- Īotov, Valeri and Atanasov, Georgi. *Skala. Krepost ot X–XI v. do s. Kladentsi, Tervelsko*. Sofia: Pensoft, 1998.
- Janković, Militsa and Janković, Đorđe. "Podunavski gradovi pomenuti kao postradali 1072 godine." *Godišnjak Muzeja grada Beograda* 25 (1978): 41–57.
- Jerney, János. "A magyarországi besenyőkről." *A magyar tudós társaság évkönyve* 5 (1842): 144–84.
- Jireček, Konstantin. "Einige Bemerkungen über die Überreste der Petschenegen und Kumanen, sowie über die Völkerschaften der sogenannten Gagauzi und Surguči im heutigen Bulgarien." *Sitzungsberichte der Königl. Böh. Gesellsch. der Wissensch.* *Classe für Philosophie, Geschichte und Philologie* (1889): 3–30.
- Juhász, Péter. "Nomád szállásváltások. Besenyők és magyarok." *Belvedere Meridionale* 28 (2016), no. 4: 83–93.
- Kaldellis, Anthony. *Ethnography after Antiquity: Foreign Lands and People in Byzantine Literature*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013.
- Kalinina, Tatyana M. "Genealogii vostochnoyevropeyskikh narodov v istoricheskom soznanii srednevekovykh arabskikh pisateley." In *Drevneyshiy gosudarstva Vostochnoy Yevropy* (2002). *Genealogiya kak forma istoricheskoy pamyati*, ed. Yelena A. Mel'nikova, 102–13. Moscow: Vostochnaya literatura, 2004.
- Kalinina, Tatyana M. "Dneprovsko-donskoy basseyn v predstavleniyakh arabopersidskikh geografov IX–X vv." *Khazarskiy al'manakh* 6 (2007): 106–19.
- Kalinina, Tatyana M. "Pechenegi i put' iz Urgencha k nim." In *Drevneyshiy gosudarstva Vostochnoy Yevropy* (2009). *Transkontinental'nyye i lokal'nyye puti kak sotsiokul'turnyy fenomen*, ed. Tatyana N. Jackson, 96–109. Moscow: Indrik, 2010.
- Kalinina, Tatyana M. "Granitsy pechenegov po 'Anonimnoy zapiske.'" In *Vostochnaya Yevropa v drevnosti i srednevekov'ye*, 21, eds. Yelena A. Mel'nikova et al., 119–25. Moscow: Nauka, 2009.
- Kalinina, Tatyana M. "Khudud al-'Alam' o granitsakh pechenegov." In *Istochniki po istorii kochevnikov*, 54–6.
- Kapitánffy, István. *Hungarobyzantína. Bizánc és a görögök a középkori magyarországi forrásokban*. Budapest: Typotex, 2003.

- Karácsonyi, János. "Néhány besenyő és kun helynevről." *Magyar nyelv* 17 (1921), no. 9–10, 211–12.
- Karadja, Constantin. "Karadja, nume peceneg in toponimia Românească." *RI* 29 (1943), 87–92.
- Karatay, Osman. "Etelköz: Ortanca Macar Yurdu Hakkında Yeni Bazı Tespitler." *Bellekten* 78 (2014), no. 281: 41–91.
- Kashpar, Aloizii O. "Raskopki kurganov v okrestnostyakh Simferopolya proizvedenyye prof. N.I. Veselovskim v 1895 godu." *Izvēstiya Tavricheskoy uchenoy arkhivnoy komissii* 24 (1896): 138–50.
- Katona-Kiss, Attila. "Úzok a Képes Krónikában. A nyugati oguz (úz) törzsek és a Magyar királyság a XI. században." *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények* 120 (2007), no. 2: 549–76.
- Kazhdan, Alexandr P. "Ioann Mavropod, pechenegi i russkiye v seredine XI v." *ZRVI* 8 (1963): 177–84.
- Kazhdan, Alexandr P. "Once More About the 'Alleged' Russo-Byzantine Treaty (ca. 1047) and the Pecheneg Crossing of the Danube." *JÖB* 26 (1977): 65–77.
- Khazanov, Anatolii M. *Nomads and the Outside World*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1994.
- Kirilov, Chavdar. "Mnimoto izselvane na búlgari ot Paristrion. Nyakoi belezhki po vŭprosa za demografskite protsesi mezhdú Dunav i Stara planina prez XI–XII v." In *EURIKA. In honorem Ludmilae Donchevae-Petkovae*, ed. V. Grigorov et al., 355–74. Sofia: Natsionalen arheologicheski Institut s muzei, 2009.
- Kisléghi, Nagy-G. "Arankavidéki halmok." *AÉ* 27 (1907), no. 3: 266–79.
- Kisléghi, Nagy-G. "Az óbessenyői őstelep (Torontál megye)." *AÉ* 29 (1909), no. 2: 146–54.
- Kisléghi, Nagy-G. "Az óbessenyői őstelep." *AÉ* 31 (1911), no. 2, 147–64.
- Klyashtornyi, Sergei G. *Istoriya Tsentral'noy Azii i pamyatniki runicheskogo pis'ma*. Saint Petersburg: Filologicheskii fakul'tet SPbGU, 2003.
- Klyashtornyi, Sergei G. and Sultanov, Tursun I. *Gosudarstva i narody Yevraziyskikh stepy. Drevnost' i srednevekov'ye*. Saint Petersburg: Orientalia, 2000.
- Kniezsa, István. "A nyugat-magyarországi besenyők kérdéséhez." In *Emlékkönyv Domanovszky Sándor születése hatvanadik fordulójának ünnepére*, 323–337. Budapest: Királyi Magyar Egyetemi Nyomda, 1937.
- Kniezsa, István. "Magyarország népei a XI-ik században." *Emlékkönyv Szent István király halálának kilencszázadik évfordulóján*, vol. 2, ed. Jusztinián Serédi, 365–472. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1938.
- Knyazkiĭ, Igor' O. "Polovtsy v Dnestrovsko-Karpatskikh zemlyakh i Nizhnem Podunav'ye v kontse XII – pervykh desyatletiyakh XIII v." In *Sotsial'no-ekonomicheskaya i politicheskaya istoriya Moldavii perioda feodalizma*, ed. Pavel V. Sovetov, 22–32. Kishinev: Shtiintsa, 1988.
- Knyazkiĭ, Igor' O. *Rus' i Step'*. Moscow: Nauka, 1996.

- Knyazkiĭ, Igor' O. *Vizantiya i kochevniki yuzhnorusskikh stepey*. Kolomna: Izdaniye Kolomenskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo instituta, 2000.
- Knyazkiĭ, Igor' O. "Polovtsy v Nizhnem Podunav'ye." *VopIs* (2000), no. 3: 121–9.
- Knyazkiĭ, Igor' O. "Russko-vizantiyskaya voyna 941–944 gg. i Khazariya." In *Khazary. Vtoroy mezhdunarodnyy kollokvium. Tezisy*, 51–3. Moscow: Institut slavyanovedeniya RAN, 2002.
- Kogonashvili, Konstantin K. "Kvoprosu osrednevekovom naselenii Severnogo Kryma (po materialam arkheologicheskikh raskopok 1962–1964 gg.)." In Askold A. Shchepinskiĭ and Yelena N. Cherepanova, *Drevnosti stepnogo Kryma. Severnoye Prisivash'ye v V – I tysyacheletiyakh do n.e.*, 299–321. Simferopol: Izdatel'stvo "Krym," 1969.
- Kogonashvili, Konstantin K. and Makhneva, Olga A. "O novykh otkrytiyakh pogrebeniy srednevekovykh kochevnikov v kurganakh Kryma." In *Uchenyye zapiski Sverdlovskogo pedagogicheskogo instituta i Tyumenskogo pedagogicheskogo instituta* 158 (1971): 113–6.
- Kolia-Dermizaki, Athina. "Michael VII Doukas, Robert Guiscard, and the Byzantine-Norman Marriage Negotiations." *BS* 58 (1997), no. 2: 251–68.
- Koltukhov, Sergei G., Kislyĭ, Alexandr E. and Toshchev, Gennadiĭ N. *Kurgannyye drevnosti Kryma. (Po materialam raskopok Severo-Krymskoy ekspeditsii 1991–1992 gg.)*, vol. 1. Zaporizhia, 1994.
- Koltukhov, Sergei G., Kolotukhin, Vitalii L. and Kislyĭ, Alexandr E. "O rabotakh Severo-Krymskoy ekspeditsii." In *Arkheologicheskiye issledovaniya v Krymu (1993)*, eds. Vadim A. Kutaĭsov et al., 153–62. Simferopol: Tavriya, 1994.
- Komar, Olesiĭ V. "Khozars'kyy kahanat i rann'oseredn'ovichna nomadystyka: zavershennyya epokhy." *ADIU* (2010), no. 1: 137–43.
- Komar, Olesiĭ V. "Drevniye mad'yary Etel'keza: perspektivy issledovaniy." *ADIU* (2011), no. 7: 21–78.
- Komar, Olesiĭ V. "Mesto gibeli knyazya Svyatoslava: poiski, legendy, gipotezy, mistifikatsii." *Stratum plus* (2014), no. 5: 235–56.
- Komar, Olesiĭ V. *Istoriya i arkheologiya drevnikh mad'yar v epokhu migratsii – A korai magyarság vándorlásának történeti és régészeti emlékei*. Budapest: Martin Opitz Kiadó, 2018.
- Komar, Olesiĭ V. and Shelemetyeva, Tetyana I. "Pechenezhskiy nabor ukrasheniyy uzdy iz nakhodki u s. Balki." *Stratum Plus* (2019), no. 5: 209–23.
- Komatarova-Balinova, Evgeniya. "The 'Pechenegs' from Pliska and Odartsi and Their 'Amulets'-Riders." In *Mikheyevs'ki chytannya*, eds. Victor S. Aksyonov and Volodymyr V. Koloda, 66–78. Kharkiv: Maydan, 2019.
- Konovalova, Irina G. "Arabskiy istochniki XII–XIV vv. po istorii Karpato-Dnestrovskikh zemel'." In *Drevneyshyye gosudarstva na territorii SSSR: Materialy i issledovaniya. 1990 z.*, ed. Anatolii P. Novosel'tsev, 5–115. Moscow: Nauka, 1991.

- Konovalova, Irina G. *Vostochnaya Yevropa v sochinenii al-Idrisi*. Moscow: Izdatel'skaya firma "Vostochnaya literatura" RAN, 1999.
- Konovalova, Irina G. and Perkhavko, Valerii B. *Drevnyaya Rus' i Nizhneye Podunav'ye*. Moscow: Pamyatniki istoricheskoy mysli, 2000.
- Kordé, Zoltán. "A magyarországi besenyők az Árpád-korban." *Acta historica* 90 (1990): 3–21.
- Kordé, Zoltán. "Kabars, Sicules et Petchenégues: les Hongrois et les auxiliaires militaires." In *Les Hongrois et l'Europe: conquête et intégration*, eds. Sándor Csernus and Klára Korompay, 231–9. Paris-Szeged: Institut Hongrois de Paris, 1999.
- Kossányi, Béla. "Az úzok és kománok történetéhez a XI–XII. Században." *Századok* 57–58 (1923–1924), no. 1–6: 519–37.
- Kovács, Attila. "A 10. századi besenyő törzsszervezet és szállásterület problémáinak újragondolása." *Belvedere Meridionale* 23 (2011), no. 4: 34–57.
- Kovács, Attila. "1071: besenyők, magyarok, bizánciak." *Acta historica* 139 (2017): 45–53.
- Kovács, Szilvia. "Cuman integration in Hungary." In *Nomads in the Sedentary World*, eds. Anatolii M. Khazanov and Andre Wink, 103–127. Richmond: Routledge, 2001.
- Kovács, Szilvia. *A kunok története a mongol hódításig*. Budapest: Balassi Kiadó, 2014.
- Kovács, Szilvia. "The Cuman Campaigns in 1091." *Golden Horde Review* 1(3) (2014): 174–89.
- Kovács, Szilvia and Zimonyi, István. "Besenyők, úzok és kunok a Kárpát-medencében." In *Török nyelvű népek a középkori Magyar Királyságban*, eds. Szilvia Kovács and István Zimonyi, 7–34. Szeged: Innovarium, 2016. In Russian: "Kochevniki i Vengry v X–XIV vv." In *Tyurkskiye kochevniki v Azii i Yevrope*, 146–68.
- Kozlov, Sergeĭ A. "Vizantiyskiye avtory ob uchastii pechenegov v russko-vizantiyskoy voyne 970–971 gg. i ikh istochniki." *Vestnik Tyumenskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta* (2011), no. 2: 33–40.
- Kozlov, Sergeĭ A. "Vizantiyskaya traditsiya o posledney vizantino-pechenezhskoy voyne." *Yevropa: Mezhdunarodnyy al'manakh* 10 (2011): 7–22.
- Kozlov, Sergeĭ A. "Konstantin Bagryanorodnyy o pechenezhskikh 'femakh' (DAI. cap. 37) i problema yego istochnikov." In *Vostochnaya Yevropa v drevnosti i srednevekov'ye. Migratsii, rasseleniye, vojna kak faktory politogeneza: XXIV Chteniya pamyati V.T. Pashuto (Moskva, IVI RAN, 18–20.04.2012 g.)*, ed. Yelena A. Mel'nikova, 113–120. Moscow: Institut vseobshchey istorii RAN, 2012.
- Kozlov, Sergeĭ A. "K voprosu o datirovke poyavleniya pechenegov v Nizhnem Podunav'ye." *VizVrem* 71 (2012), 57–73.
- Kozlov, Sergeĭ A. "Rassказы L'va Diakona i Skilitsy o bitve Svyatoslava pod Dorostolom (971 g.): fragment utrachennogo vizantiyskogo eposa?" *Stratum plus* (2013), no. 5: 151–60.
- Kozlov, Sergeĭ A. "Bol'she, chem vrag: Osobennosti izobrazheniya pechenegov v vizantiyskoy literature epokhi pervykh Komninov." *BS* 72 (2013), no. 1–2: 145–61.

- Kozlov, Sergei A. "Byzantinopecenacica I: Bogas i Kegen – pechenezhskiye 'yazyki' na vizantiyskoy sluzhbe." *AEMAE* 20 (2013): 103–27.
- Kozlov, Sergei A. "More than Enemies. The Description of Nomads in the Byzantine Literature of the Epoch of the First Pecheneg Incursions into Byzantium." In *Rules and Violence/Regeln und Gewalt: On the Cultural History of Collective Violence from Late Antiquity to the Confessional Age*, eds. Cora Dietl and Titus Knäpper, 83–99. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2014.
- Kozlov, Sergei A. "Folklore and 'Invading Pechenegs' on Byzantine and Slavic Miniatures." in *Actual Problems of Theory and History of Art – 2015: Abstracts of communications of the 6th International Conference*, 42. Saint Petersburg, 2015.
- Kozlov, Vladimir I. *Naseleniye stepnogo mezhdurech'ya Dunaya i Dnestra kontsa VIII-nachala XI veka n. e. (Balkano-Dunayskaya kul'tura)* [Dissertation]. Leningrad, 1991. Chişinău: Stratum Plus, 2015 [book edition].
- Kradin, Nikolai N. "A Panorama of Social Archaeology in Russia." In *Comparative Archaeologies: A Sociological View of the Science of the Past*, ed. Ludomir Lozny, 243–71. New York: Springer, 2011.
- Kravchenko, Eduard E. "Poseleniya khazarskogo vremeni (Severo-Vostochnoye Priazov'ye, Donetskyy Kryazh, Stepnoye Podontsov'ye)." *Arkheologicheskyy al'manakh* 30 (2013): 278–302.
- Krieger, Vladimir A. *Kochevniki Zapadnogo Kazakhstana i sopredel'nykh territoriy v sredniye veka (X–XIV vv.)*. Oral: Yevraziyskiy soyuz uchenykh, 2012.
- Kristó, Gyula. "Sírhelyekre vonatkozó adatok korai." *Acta Historica ASH* 71 (1981): 21–8.
- Kristó, Gyula. *Az Árpád-kor háborúi*. Budapest: Zrínyi Katonai Könyv- és Lapkiadó, 1986.
- Kristó, Gyula. *Hungarian history in the 9th century*. Szeged: Szegedi Középkorász Műhely, 1996.
- Kristó, Gyula. *Nichtungarische Völker im mittelalterlichen Ungarn*. Herne: Tibor Schäfer Verlag, 2008.
- Kropotkin, Vladislav V. *Klady vizantiyskikh monet na territorii SSSR*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1962.
- Kruglov, Yevgenii V. "Pogrebal'nyy obryad oguzov Severnogo Prikaspiya 2-y pol. IX – 1-y pol. XI v." *Stepi Yevropy v epokhu srednevekov'ya* 2 (2001): 395–446.
- Kruglov, Yevgenii V. "Pechenegi i oguzy: nekotoryye problemy arkheologicheskikh istochnikov." *Stepi Yevropy v epokhu srednevekov'ya* 3 (2003): 13–83.
- Krumova, Teodora. "Pechenezhskiye pamyatniki v Severo-Vostochnoy Bolgarii." *Analele Asociației Naționale a Tinerilor Istorici din Moldova* (1999), no. 1: 142–9.
- Krumova, Teodora. "Secondary Usage of Pecheneg Bridlebosses as Dress Decoration." *AB* 5 (2001): 65–70.
- Krumova, Teodora. "Pecheneg Chieftains in the Byzantine Administration in the Theme of Paristrion in the Eleventh Century." *Annual of Medieval Studies at the CEU* 11 (2005): 207–21.

- Kudryashov, Konstantin V. *Polovetskaya step'.* *Ocherki istoricheskoy geografii.* Moscow: OGIZ, 1948.
- Kunick, Arist A. "O torskikh pechenegakh i polovtsakh po mad'yarskim istochnikam s ukazaniem na noveyskiye issledovaniya o chernomorsko-torskikh narodakh ot Attily do Chingiskhana." *Uchenyya Zapiski Akademii Nauk po pervomu i tret'yemu otdeleniyam* 3 (1855), no. 5: 714–41.
- Kurat, Akdes N. *Peçenek tarihi.* İstanbul: Devlet basimevi, 1937.
- Kurat, Akdes N. "Peçeneklere dair araştırmalar." *Türkiyat Mecmuası* 5 (1936): 101–40.
- Kurat, Akdes N. *IV–XVIII. Yüzyillarda Karadeniz Kuzeyindeki Türk Kavimleri ve Devletleri.* Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu basimevi, 1972.
- Kurbatov, Georgii L. "V.G. Vasil'yevskiy i nachalo vizantinovedeniya v Peterburgskom universitete." In *Problemy otechestvennoy i vseobshchey istorii*, ed. Vladimir G. Revunenkov, 133–52. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo universiteta, 1969.
- Kurbatov, Georgii L. *Istoriya Vizantii. Istoriografiya.* Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo universiteta, 1975.
- Kutaysov, Vadim A. "Materialy k arheologicheskoy karte Severo-Zapadnogo Kryma XI–XV vv." *Istoricheskoye naslediyе Kryma* 9 (2005): 57–61.
- Kuzmichevskii P. [pseud. of Mykhailo P. Dragomanov], M., "Sholudiviy Bunyaka v ukrainskikh narodnykh skazaniyakh." *Kiyevskaya Starina* 18 (1887), no. 8: 676–713; 19 (1887), no. 10: 233–76.
- Kvitnyts'kyi, Maksym V. "Torky. Problema atrybutsiyi pokhoval'nykh kompleksiv." *Arkheolohiya* (2004), no. 4: 25–34.
- Kvitnyts'kyi, Maksym V. "Kochovyky pivdennorus'koho stepu za doby rozvynutoho seredn'ovichchya (istoriohafiya, stan ta perspektyvy doslidzhennya)." *ADIU* (2010), no. 1: 116–23.
- Kyriazopoulos, Christos. *I Thráki katá tous 100–120 aiónes: symvolí sti meléti tis politikís, dioikitikís kai ekklesiastikís tis exélixi* [Ph.D. thesis]. Thessaloniki, 1997.
- Kyzlasov, Igor' L. *Runicheskoye pis'mennosti yevraziyskikh stepey.* Moscow: Izdatel'skaya firma "Vostochnaya literatura" RAN, 1994.
- Langó, Péter. "Archaeological Research on the Conquering Hungarians: A Review." In *Research on the Prehistory of the Hungarians*, 175–340.
- Langó, Péter and Türk, Attila. "Régészeti adatok a Kárpát-medence 10–11. századi hagyatékának bulgáriaikapcsolatrendszeréhez I. A csüngős veretek." *A Móra Ferenc Múzeum Évkönyve: Studia Archaeologica* 12 (2011): 517–28.
- Lapteva, Lyudmila. "Slavisticheskoye issledovaniya v Russkom arheologicheskoy institute v Konstantinopole." In *Slavyanovedeniye v dorevol'yutsionnoy Rossii. Izucheniye yuzhnykh i zapadnykh slavyan*, eds. Dmitrii F. Markov and Vladimir A. Dyakov, 345–54. Moscow: Nauka, 1988.



- Leahu, Valeriu and Trohani, Gheorghe. "Două norminte de călăreți nomazi din cîmpia Teleormanului." *SCIVA* 29 (1978), no. 4: 529–40.
- Lefort, Jacques. "Rhétorique et politique. Trois discours de Jean Mauropous en 1047." *Travaux et Mémoires* (1976), no. 6: 265–303.
- Lemerle, Paul. *Cinq études sur le XIe siècle byzantin*. Paris: Éditions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1977.
- Lesnichiĭ, Petro P. and Shalobudov, Volodymyr N. "K istorii izucheniya pozdnekochevnicheskikh drevnostey Severnogo Podneprov'ya." In *Problemy arkheolohiyi Podniprovy'a*, ed. Iryna F. Kovalyova, 100–17. Dnipropetrovs'k: RVV DNU, 2003.
- Levchenko, Mitrofan V. *Istoriya Vizantii. Kratkiy ocherk*. Moscow/Leningrad: Sotsekgiz, 1940.
- Levchenko, Mitrofan V. *Ocherki po istorii russko-vizantiyskikh otnosheniy*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1956.
- Liaskorons'kiĭ, Vasyĭ' G. "Russkiye pokhody v stepi v udel'no-vechevoye vremya i pokhod kn. Vitovta na tatar v 1399 g." *ZhMNP* 9 (1907) no. 5: 1–45.
- Ligeti, Lajos (ed.). *A magyarság őstörténete*. Budapest: Franklin Társulat Nyomdája, 1943.
- Ligeti, Lajos. *A magyar nyelv török kapcsolatai a honfoglalás előtt és az Árpád-korban*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1986.
- Litavrin, Gennadiĭ G. *Bolgariya i Vizantiya v XI–XII vv.* Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1960.
- Lounghis, Telemachos C. "Über die zwei gegensätzlichen Richtungen der byzantinischen Außenpolitik im osteuropäischen Raum im 10. Jahrhundert." In *Byzanz und Ostmitteleuropa 950–1453*, 35–43.
- Lozovan, Eugène. "De la Mer Baltique à la Mer Noire." In *Die Araber in der Alten Welt*, vol. 2, *Bis zur Reichstrennung*, eds. Franz Altheim and Ruth Stiehl, 524–54. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1965.
- Lukacs, Anthal. "Observații privind răspîndirea căldărilor de lut pe teritoriul României." *SCIVA* 35 (1984), no. 4: 320–30.
- Lyubarskiĭ, Yakov N. "Zamechaniya k khronologii XI knigi 'Aleksiady' Anny Komninoy." *VizVrem* 23 (1963): 47–56.
- Lyubarskiĭ, Yakov N. "Ob istochnikakh 'Aleksiady' Anny Komninoy." *VizVrem* 25 (1964): 99–120.
- Lyubarskiĭ, Yakov N. "[Review of:] Gautier P., *Le Discours de Thèophylacte de Bulgarie à l'autocrator Alexis I-er Comnene (6 janvier 1088)*, RÉB, XX, 1962, p. 93–130." *VizVrem* 25 (1964): 269–70.
- Lyubarskiĭ, Yakov N. "Vizantiysko-pechenezhskaya voyna 1086–1091 gg. na territorii Balkan." In *Slavyanskiye issledovaniya. Materialy 2-y Velikorusskoy mezhvuzovskoy konferentsii po istorii slavyanskikh stran*, ed. Askold I. Doronchenkov, 3–9. Leningrad: Lenizdat, 1966.

- Macartney, Carlile Aylmer. *The Magyars in the Ninth Century*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1930.
- Macartney, Carlile Aylmer. "The Pechenegs." *SEER* 8 (1929–1930), no. 22: 342–55.
- Macartney, Carlile Aylmer. "The Attack on 'Valandar.'" *BNJ* 8 (1931): 159–70.
- Madgearu, Alexandru. "Observații asupra revoltei din Paradunavon din 1072–1091." In *Istorie și ideologie. Omagiul profesorului Stelian Brezeanu la 60 de ani*, ed. Manuela Dobre, 34–46. Bucharest: Editura Universității din București, 2002.
- Madgearu, Alexandru. "The Periphery against the Centre: The Case of Paradunavon." *ZRVI* 40 (2003): 49–56.
- Madgearu, Alexandru. *The Romanians in the Anonymous Gesta Hungarorum: Truth and Fiction*. Cluj-Napoca: Romanian Cultural Institute, 2005.
- Madgearu, Alexandru. "Români și Pecenegi în Sudul Transilvaniei." In *Relații interetnice în Transilvania (secolele VI–XIII)*, eds. Zeno Karl Pinter et al., 111–20. Bucharest: Editura Economică, 2005.
- Madgearu, Alexandru. "The Dridu Culture and the Changing Position of Romania among the Communist States." *AB* 11 (2007), no. 2: 51–9.
- Madgearu, Alexandru. "The Pechenegs in the Byzantine Army." In *The Steppe Lands and the World beyond Them*, 207–18.
- Madgearu, Alexandru. *Byzantine Military Organization on the Danube, 10th–12th Centuries*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2013.
- Madgearu, Alexandru. "A Comparison between Two Migrations in the Byzantine Empire: The Goths and the Pechenegs." *Plural* 3 (2015) no. 2: 17–26.
- Makk, Ferenc. *The Árpáds and the Comneni*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1989.
- Makk, Ferenc. "Saint Ladislav et les Balkans." *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis de Attila József nominatae. Opuscula Byzantina* 9 (1994): 59–67.
- Makk, Ferenc. *Ungarische Aussenpolitik (896–1196)*. Herne: Tibor Schäfer Verlag, 1999.
- Malamut, Élisabeth. "L'image byzantine des Petchénègues." *BZ* 85 (1995), no. 1: 105–47.
- Malamut, Élisabeth. "Les peuples étrangers dans l'idéologie impériale. Scythes et Occidentaux." In: *L'étranger au Moyen Âge. Actes des congrès de la Société des historiens médiévistes de l'enseignement supérieur public, 30<sup>e</sup> congrès, Göttingen, 1999*, 119–32. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 2000.
- Marcsik, Antonia. "Antropologičeskaya kharakteristika srednevekovogo kunskogo i vengerskogo naseleniya (kratkiy obzor)." In *Tyurkskiye kochevniki v Azii i Yevrope*, 114–19.
- Marek, Miloš. "Dávne etniká na stredovekom Slovensku (Kovari, Chvalízi, Kumáni a Jasi)." *Historický zborník* 13 (2003), no. 1–2: 35–53.
- Marek, Miloš. "Pečenehovia a Uzi na Slovensku." *Historický časopis* 51 (2003), no. 2: 193–222.
- Marjanović-Vujović, Gordana. "Archaeological Proving the Presence of the Pechenegs in Beograd Town." *Balcanoslavica* 3 (1974), 183–8.

- Marquart, Josef. *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge. Ethnologische und historisch-topographische Studien zur Geschichte des 9. und 10. Jahrhunderts. (ca. 840–940)*. Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1903.
- Marquart, Josef. "Über das Volkstum der Komanen: ein weiterer Beitrag zur Geschichte der Völkerwanderungen im ostasiatisch-osteuropäischen Steppengürtel." *Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-Historische Klasse. Neue Folge* (1912–1914): 25–236.
- Matyushko, Irina V. *Pogrebal'nyy obryad kochevnikov stepey Priural'ya v IX–XIV vv.* Kazan: Universitet, 2008.
- Mavrodina, Ruslana M. *Kiyevskaya Rus' i kochevniki (pechenegi, torki, polovtsy). Istoriograficheskiy ocherk*. Leningrad: Nauka, 1983.
- Mayko, Vadym V. "Kochevnicheskiye elementy gorodskoy kul'tury Sugdei X–XI vv. Moda ili neodnorodnost' etnosa." In *Starodavniy Iskorosten' i slov'yans'ki hrady*, vol. 2, ed. Olexandr P. Motsya, 20–8. Korosten': Triada S, 2008.
- Mayko, Vadym V. "Arkheologicheskaya situatsiya v srednevekovoy Tavrike i na Tamani v seredine X v. (k voprosu o vremeni smeny arkheologicheskikh kul'tur)." *Khazarskiy al'manakh* 10 (2012): 100–21.
- Mayko, Vadym V. *Vostochnyy Krym vo vtoroy polovine X–XI vv.* Kyiv: Vydavets' Oleh Filyuk, 2014.
- Mănucu-Adameșteanu, Gheorghe. "Aspecte ale politicii împăratului Alexios I Comnenul la Dunărea de Jos în lumina ultimelor descoperiri sfragistice și numismatice." *RI* (1995), no. 3–4: 345–69.
- Mănucu-Adameșteanu, Gheorghe. "La diffusion de la monnaie byzantine en Dobroudja aux IXe–Xe siècles." *RÉSEE* 34 (1996), no. 3–4: 275–87.
- Mănucu-Adameșteanu, Gheorghe. "Nashestiya pechenegov na Nizhnem Dunaye (1027–1048 gg.)." *Stratum plus* (2000), no. 6: 345–61. In French: "Les invasions des Pethénègues au Bas-Danube (1027–1048)." *ÉByz* 4 (2001): 87–112.
- Mănucu-Adameșteanu, Gheorghe. "Les invasions des Petchénègues au Bas Danube." In *Numizmatichni, sfragistichni i epigrafski prinosi kŭm istoriyata na Chernomorskoto kraïbrezhie. (Proceedings of the International Conference "Numismatic and Sphragistic Contributions to History of the Western Black Sea Coast," Varna, September 12th–15th, 2001.)*, eds. Valeri İotov and Igor Lazarenko, 299–311. Varna, 2004.
- Mănucu-Adameșteanu, Gheorghe. "Din nou despre atacul cumanilor din anul 1095 și încetarea locuirii de la Păcuiul lui Soare." In *Simpozion de numismatică dedicat împlinirii a patru secole de la prima unire a românilor sub Mihai Voievod Viteazul, Chișinău, 28–30 mai 2000. Comunicări, studii și note*, ed. Eugen Nicolae, 109–20. Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 2001.
- Mănucu-Adameșteanu, Gheorghe. *Istoria Dobrogei in perioada 969–1204. Contribuții arheologice și numismatice*. Bucharest: Editura Mad Linotype, 2001.

- Mănuclu-Adameșteanu, Gheorghe and Îordanov, Stoyan. "Monede bizantine din secolele X–XI descoperite pe teritoriul localității Garvăn, ținutul Siliștra și invazia pecenegilor din 1046–1047." In *Simpozion de numismatică organizat în memoria martirilor căzuți la Valea Albă, la împlinirea a 525 de ani (1476–2001), Chișinău, 13–15 mai 2001. Comunicări, studii și note*, 125–38. Bucharest: Editura Enciclopedică, 2002.
- Mărculeț, Vasile. "Considérations concernant la fin du pouvoir des Petchénègues du Bas-Danube." *Annales d'Université "Valahia" Târgoviște. Section d'Archéologie et d'Histoire* 14 (2012), no. 2: 93–104.
- Medvedev, Igor' P. "Excellent Scholar – Excellent Forger: The Case of Karl Benedict Hase." In *Manufacturing a Past for the Present*, 144–55. '
- Melnyk, Mykola. "Rosiy's'ka i radyans'ka istoriohrafiya stosunkiv Vizantiyi i kochivnykiv Pivnichnoho Prychornomor'ya yak kolonial'nyy dyskurs: do postanovky problemy." *Naukovi zapysky Natsional'noho universytetu "Ostroz'ka akademiya." Istorychni nauky. Na poshanu profesora Mykoły Koval's'koho* 4 (2004): 96–105.
- Melnyk, Mykola. "On the Issue of the Authenticity of the Names of Pecheneg Rulers in the Nikonian Chronicle." In *The Steppe Lands and the World beyond Them*, 151–60.
- Menges, Karl H. "Etymological Notes on Some Păcănăg Names." *Byzantion* 17 (1944–1945): 256–80.
- Meško, Marek. "Snaha Byzancie o konečné riešenie pečenežského problému: Výprava Alexia I. Komnéna proti Dristre roku 1087." *Medea. Studia mediaevalia et antiqua* 9 (2005): 6–20.
- Meško, Marek. "Vývin obranného systému Byzantskej ríše v 11. storočí – príklad témy Paradounavon." *Byzantinoslovaca* (2006), no. 1: 128–43.
- Meško, Marek. "Bitka pri Beroe 1122: Posledný boj Pečenehov." *Vojenská história* 11 (2007), no. 4: 3–26.
- Meško, Marek. "Byzancia a nomádi. Byzantská diplomacia na čiernomorskej stepi." *Historická revue* 20 (2009), no. 7/8: 66–7.
- Meško, Marek. "Notes sur la chronologie de la guerre des Byzantins contre les Petchénègues (1083–1091)." *BS* 69 (2011): 134–48.
- Meško, Marek. "Pečenežsko-byzantské dobrodružstvo uhorského kráľa Šalamúna (1083–1087)." *Konštantínove listy* 4 (2011): 77–94.
- Meško, Marek. *Obnova byzantskej moci na Balkáne za vlády Alexia I. Komnéna. Druhá byzantsko-pečenežská vojna (1083–1091)*. Nitra: Vydavateľ Univerzita Konštantína Filozofa v Nitre, 2012.
- Meško, Marek. "K veľkosti pečenežských zoskupení (hórd) na Balkáne v druhej polovici 11. storočia." *Byzantinoslovaca* 4 (2012): 17–27.
- Meško, Marek. "Pecheneg Groups in the Balkans (ca. 1053–1091) According to the Byzantine Sources." In *The Steppe Lands and the World beyond Them*, 179–205.

- Meško, Marek. "Nová pravdepodobná príčina kumánskeho vpádu na byzantský Balkán roku 1095." *Byzantinoslovaca* 5 (2014): 192–204.
- Meško, Marek. "An Overview of Byzantine Sources about the Pechenegs." In *On Research Methodology in Ancient and Byzantine History*, eds. Jarmila Bednaříková et al., 169–79. Brno: Masaryk University, 2015.
- Meško, Marek. "Nomads and Byzantium. Problematic Aspects of Maintaining Diplomatic Relations with the Pechenegs." In *On Research Methodology in Ancient and Byzantine History*, 181–93.
- Metz, Nonna D. "K voprosu o torkakh." *Kratkiye soobshcheniya Instituta istorii material'noy kul'tury* 23 (1948): 45–9.
- Mikhailova, Tonka. "Küsnonomadski grobove v Dvortsoviya tsentür na Pliska." *Pliska-Preslav* 9 (2003): 259–66.
- Minenkova, Nataliya Ye. *Kochovyky Pivdenno-Skhidnoyi Yevropy X–I polovyni XIII st. v ukrajins'kiy i rosiys'kiy istoriohrafiyi* [Candidate's thesis]. Donetsk, 2005.
- Mishkova, Diana. "The Afterlife of a Commonwealth: Narratives of Byzantium in the National Historiographies of Greece, Bulgaria, Serbia and Romania." In *Entangled Histories of the Balkans*, 118–273.
- Mladenov, Stefan. "Pechenegi i uzi-kumani v bülgarskata istoriya." *Bülgarska istoricheska biblioteka* 4 (1931): 113–36.
- Mokhov, Anton S. "K voprosu o vizantiyskoy voyennoy organizatsii v period voyny s pechenegami 1046–1053 gg." *Izvestiya Ural'skogo federal'nogo universiteta. Seriya 2: Gumanitarnyye nauki* 39 (2005), no. 10: 15–26.
- Moravcsik, Gyula. *Byzantinoturcica I. Die Byzantinischen Quellen der Geschichte der Türkvölker; Byzantinoturcica II. Sprachreste der Türkvölker in den byzantinischen Quellen*. Budapest: Királyi Magyar Pázmány Péter Tudományegyetemi, Görög Filológiai Intézet, 1942–1943. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1958 (2nd edition).
- Moravcsik, Gyula. "Byzantinische Mission im Kreise der Türkvölker an der Nordküste des Schwarzen Meers." In *The Proceedings of the XIIIth International Congress*, 15–28.
- Moravcsik, Gyula. *Einführung in die Byzantinologie*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1976.
- Moskov, Mosko. "Küm voprosa za pechenezhko-kumanskiya superstrat v bülgarskiya ezik." *Izvestiya na instituta za bülgarskiya ezik* 8 (1962): 151–61.
- Moyseidou, Giasmina. *To Vyzántio kai oi vóreioi geitonés tou ton 10-o aióna*. Athens: Vasilópoulos Stéfanos D., 1995.
- Mutafchiev, Petär. *Istoriya na bülgarski narod*, vol. 1, *Pürvo bülgarsko tsarstvo*, vol. 2, *Vtoro bülgarsko tsarstvo*. Sofia: Bülgarska kniga, 1943.
- Mutafchiev, Petär. *Lektsii po istoriya na Vizantiya*, 2 vols. Sofia: Fond za podpomagane na studentite, 1947.
- Mutafchiev, Petär. *Dobrudzha v minaloto: Bülgari i rumüni v istoriyata na dunavskite zemi*. Sofia: Stefanka Bankova, 1999.

- Nagy, Árpád. "Eger környéki és Tisza-vidéki besenyő települések a X–XI. százabban (Kísérlet a magyarországi besenyő régészeti hagyatékának meghatározására)." *Egri Múzeum Évkönyve* 7 (1969): 129–57.
- Nagy, Árpád. "A magyarhoni lovas sírok." *AE* 13 (1893): 223–34.
- Nagy, Géza. "A régi kunok temetkezése." *AE* 13 (1893): 105–17.
- Nakhapetyan, Valentina. E. "Graffiti Mayatskogo gorodishcha." In *Mayatskiy arheologicheskiy kompleks. Materialy sovetsko-bolgaro-vengerskoy ekspeditsii*, ed. Svetlana A. Pletnyova, 41–91. Moscow: Nauka, 1990.
- Narozhnyi, Yevgenii I. *Srednevekovyye kochevniki Severnogo Kavkaza*. Armavir: Armavirskoye poligrafpredpriyatiye, 2005.
- Necşulescu, Constantin. "Ipoteza formaţiunilor politice române la Dunăre în sec. XI." *RIR* 7 (1937): 122–51.
- Necşulescu, Constantin. "Năvălirea uzilor prin Țările Române în Imperiul Bizantin." *RIR* 9 (1939): 185–204.
- Németh, Gyula. "Zur Kenntnis der Petschenegen." *KCSA* 3 (1922): 219–25.
- Németh, Gyula. "Die Petschenegischen Stammesnamen." *Ungarische Jahrbücher* 10 (1930): 27–34.
- Németh, Gyula. "Die Volksnamen Quman und Qün." *KCSA* 3 (1940): 95–109.
- Németh, Gyula. "The Runiform Inscriptions from Nagy-Szent-Miklós and the Runiform Scripts of Eastern Europe." *Acta Linguistica ASH* 21 (1971), no. 1–2: 1–52.
- Neumann, Carl. "Über zwei unerklärte Völkernamen in der byzantinischen Armee (Kulpinger und Talmatzer)." *BZ* 3 (1894): 374–85.
- Neville, Leonora A. *Guide to Byzantine Historical Writing*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- Niculescu, Gheorghe-Alexandru. "Nationalism and the Representation of Society in Romanian Archaeology." In: *Nation and National Ideology. Past, Present and Prospects Proceedings of the International Symposium held at the New Europe College, Bucharest, april. 6–7, 2001*, ed. Irina Vainovski-Mihai, 209–34. Bucharest: New Europe College, 2002.
- Nikolov, Aleksandür. *The Cumanic Settlement in Bulgaria and Hungary in the Thirteenth Century and Its Consequences* [Ph.D. thesis]. Budapest, 1996.
- Nikolov, Aleksandür. "'Ethnos Skythikon': The Uzes in the Balkans (Facts and Interpretations)." In *The Steppe Lands and the World beyond Them*, 235–48.
- Noonan, Thomas. S. "The First Major Silver Crisis in Russia and the Baltic, c.875–c.900." *Hikuin* 11 (1985): 41–50.
- Noonan, Thomas. S. "Rus', Pechenegs, and Polovtsy: Economic Interaction along the Steppe Frontier in the pre-Mongol Era." *Russian History* 19 (1992), no. 1/4: 301–26.
- Noonan, Thomas. S. "European Russia, c.500–c.1050." *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. 3, c.900–c.1024, ed. Timothy Reuter, 487–513. Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

- Noonan, Thomas S. "Some Observations on the Economy of the Khazar Khaganate." In *The World of the Khazars*, 207–44.
- Nudelman, Avram A. *Ocherki istorii monetnogo obrashcheniya v Dnestrovsko-Prutskom regione (s drevneyshikh vremen do obrazovaniya feodal'nogo moldavskogo gosudarstva)*. Kishinev: Shtiintsa, 1985.
- Nystazopoulou-Pelekidou, Maria G. "I en Tavrikí chersoníso pólis Sougdaía apó tou XIII' méchri tou XV' aiónos." *Ypourgeío Politismouí. Ypiresía Archaioítiton kai Anastilóseos* 7 (1965): 109–60.
- Oberländer-Târnoveau, Ernest. "Un atelier monétaire byzantin inconnu de la deuxième moitié du XIe siècle dans le thème de Paristrion." *RÉSEE* 21 (1983), no. 3: 261–70.
- Oberländer-Târnoveau, Ernest. "Numismatic and Historical Remarks on the Byzantine Coin Hoards from the 12-th Century at the Lower Danube." *RÉSEE* 30 (1992), no. 1–2: 41–60.
- Oberländer-Târnoveau, Ernest. "Monede antice și bizantine descoperite la Nufăru (jud. Tulcea) păstrate în colecția Muzeului Militar Național." *Buletinul Societății Numismatice Române* 88–89 (1994–1995): 71–106.
- Oberländer-Târnoveau, Ernest. *Monedă și societate pe teritoriile de la Sud și Est de Carpați: (secolele VI–XIV)*. Cluj-Napoca: Editura Nereamia Napocae, 2003.
- Obolensky, Dimitri. "The Principles and Methods of Byzantine Diplomacy." In *Byzantium and the Slavs. Collected studies*, 43–61. London: Variorum Reprints, 1971.
- Obolensky, Dimitri. "The Empire and its Northern Neighbours." In *Byzantium and the Slavs. Collected studies*, 473–518.
- Obolensky, Dimitri. *The Byzantine Commonwealth. Eastern Europe, 500–1453*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971.
- Obolensky, Dimitri. "Byzantine Frontier Zones and Cultural Exchanges." In *Actes du XIVe Congrès*, 1, 303–13.
- Obolensky, Dimitri. "The Crimea and the North before 1204." In *The Byzantine Inheritance of Eastern Europe*, 123–33. London: Variorum Reprints, 1982.
- Oikonomidès, Nikos A. "Recherches sur l'histoire du Bas-Danube aux X–XI siècles: La Mésopotamie de l'Occident." *RÉSEE* 3 (1965), no. 1: 57–79.
- Oikonomidès, Nikos A. *Les listes de préséance byzantines des IXe et Xe siècles*. Paris: Centre National de la recherche scientifique, 1972.
- Oikonomidès, Nikos A. "Vardariotes – W.l.nd.r – V.n.nd.r: Hongrois installés dans la vallée du Vardar en 934." *SOF* 32 (1973): 1–8.
- Oikonomidès, Nikos A. "L'organisation de la frontière orientale de Byzance aux Xe–XIe ss. et le Taktikon de l'Escorial." In *Actes du XIVe Congrès*, 2, 73–90.
- Orkun, Hüseyin N. *Peçenekler*. Istanbul: Remzi Kitaphanesi, 1933.
- Orkun, Hüseyin N. *Oğuzlara dair*. Ankara: Ulus Basimevi, 1935.
- Orlov, Ruslan S. "Pivnichnoprorychomors'kyy tsentr khudozhn'oyi metaloobrobky u X–XI st." *Arkheolohiya* 47 (1984): 24–44.

- Ostrogorsky, Georg. "Die byzantinische Staatenhierarchie." *SK* 8 (1936): 41–61.
- Ostrogorsky, Georg. *History of the Byzantine State*, trans. Joan M. Hussey. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1968.
- Oța, Silviu. "Domenii ale pecenegilor și cumanilor în Banatul istoric." *Studii de Istorie a Banatului* 26–27 (2002–2003): 219–39.
- Oța, Silviu. "Populații nomade de stepă din Banat (secolele XI–XIV). Pecenegii și cumanii." *Prinos lui Petre Diaconu*, 489–520.
- Oța, Silviu. "Pecenegii din Banat. De la comunități militare la statutul nobiliar." *Apulum* 44 (2007): 315–39.
- Oța, Silviu. "Populații atestate în Banat în secolele IX–XII surse istorice și problemele arheologice." *Muzeul Național* 19 (2007), no. 1: 17–38.
- Oța, Silviu. "Piese de orfevrărie de tradiție bizantină în spațiul Nord-Dunărean (secolul al XI-lea-începutul secolului al XIII-lea)." *Între Stepă și Imperiu. Studii în onoarea lui Radu Harhoiu*, eds. Andrei Măgureanu and Erwin Gáll, 403–33. Bucharest: Renaissance, 2010.
- Oța, Silviu. *The Mortuary Archaeology of the Medieval Banat (10th–14th Centuries)*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2014.
- Pálóczi-Horváth András. "Situation des recherches archéologiques sur les Comans en Hongrie." *Acta Orientalia ASH* 27 (1973), no. 2: 201–209.
- Pálóczi-Horváth András. "L'immigration et l'établissement des Comans en Hongrie." *Acta Orientalia ASH* 29 (1975), no. 3: 313–33.
- Pálóczi-Horváth András. "Le costume Coman au moyen âge." *AArch* 32 (1980), no. 1–4: 403–27.
- Pálóczi-Horváth András. *Pechenegs, Cumans, Iasians: Steppe Peoples in Medieval Hungary*, trans. Timothy Wilkinson. Budapest: Corvina, 1989.
- Pálóczi-Horváth András. "Nomád népek a kelet-európai steppén és a középkori Magyarországon." In *Zúduló sasok*, 7–36.
- Pálóczi-Horváth András. "Pogányokkal védelmeztetjük országunkat: keleti népek a középkori Magyar Királyságban a kálizoktól a kunokig." *Studia Caroliensia* 5 (2004), no. 2: 10–30.
- Pálóczi-Horváth András. *Peoples of Eastern Origin in Medieval Hungary. The Cultural Heritage of Pechenegs, Uzes, Cumans and the Jász*, transl. Heinrich Härke et al. Budapest: Archaeolingua, 2014.
- Parkhomenko, Volodymyr O. "Pro kul'turu tyurkiv nashoho stepu IX–XIII v.v." *SSv* 3–4 (1928): 307–9.
- Parkhomenko, Volodymyr O. "Chorni klobuky." *SSv* 5 (1928): 242–6.
- Parkhomenko, Volodymyr O. "Rus' ta pechenihy. Do spravy starodavnikh zv'yazkiv Rusy zi Skhodom." *SSv* 1–2 (7–8) (1929): 287–94.
- Parkhomenko, Volodymyr O. "Kahanat Rusy." *SSv* 1–2 (7–8) (1929): 357–9.



- Parkhomenko, Volodymyr O. "K istorii derzhavy Ryurikovichey. (Obzor literatury za 1938 g.)." *VDI* (1939), no. 3: 144–7.
- Paroń, Aleksander. "Pieczyngowie na kartach *De administrando imperio* Konstantyna VII Porfirogenety." *Classica Wratislaviensia* 27 (2007): 97–112.
- Paroń, Aleksander. "Uchastiye vizantiyskoy diplomatii v ubiystve knyazyza Svyatoslava Igorevicha." *Stratum Plus* (2005–2009), no. 5: 494–9.
- Paroń, Aleksander. "Byzantium and Pechenegs in the 10th Century. An Attempt at Rethinking Their Political Relations." *Proceedings of the 22nd International Congress of Byzantine Studies, Sofia, 22-27 August 2011*, vol. 3, *Abstracts of Free Communications*, ed. Angel. Nikolov et al., 231–2. Sofia: Bulgarian Historical Heritage Foundation, 2011.
- Paroń, Aleksander. "Facta est christiana lex, in pessimo et crudelissimo populo." Bruno of Querfurt among the Pechenegs." In *The Steppe Lands and the World beyond Them*, 161–78.
- Paroń, Aleksander. "Nomades des Grandes Steppes dans les Études Polonaises Médiévales. La fin de la tradition de recherches?" *Archéologie. Annales de l'Académie Polonaise des Sciences, Centres Scientifique à Paris* 8 (2013): 171–84.
- Paroń, Aleksander. *Pieczyngowie. Koczownicy w krajobrazie politycznym i kulturowym średniowiecznej Europy*. Wrocław: Instytut Archeologii i Etnologii Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 2015. In English: *The Pechenegs: Nomads in the Political and Cultural Landscape of Medieval Europe*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2021.
- Parushev, Veselin. "Molivdovuli i moneti." In *Odürtsi*, 1, 131–6.
- Pavlov, Plamen. *Bŭlgariya, Vizantiya i kumanite* [Ph.D. thesis]. Veliko Tarnovo, 1991.
- Pavlov, Plamen. "Po vŭprosa za zaselvaniyata na kumani v Bŭlgariya prez XIII v." In *Vtori mezhdunaroden kongres*, 629–37.
- Pavlov, Plamen. "Kumanite v obshchestveno-politicheskiya zhivot na srednovekovna Bŭlgariya (1186 g. – nachaloto na XIV v.)." *IstPreg* (1990), no. 7, 17–26.
- Pavlov, Plamen. "Belezhki za nyakoi lichnosti ot bŭlgarskoto srednovekovie s ogleđ istoriyata na Dobrudzha prez XI–XIII v." *Dobrudzha* 9 (1992): 169–77.
- Pelliot, Paul. "À propos des Comans." *Journal Asiatique* 15 (1920): 125–85.
- Petkes, Zsolt. "Rűdzablák a 10–12. századi Kárpát-medencében." *Hadak útján XIX. Győr-Moson-Sopron Megyei Műzeumok Igazgatósága Tanulmányok* 3 (2012): 231–46.
- Pletnyova, Svetlana A. "Pechenegi, torki, polovtsy v yuzhnorusskikh stepyakh." In *TVDAE*, 1, 151–226.
- Pletnyova, Svetlana A. "Keramika Sarkela – Beloy Vezhi." In *TVDAE*, 2, 212–72.
- Pletnyova, Svetlana A. "Kochevnicheskiy mogil'nik bliz Sarkela – Beloy Vezhi." In *TVDAE*, 3, 216–59.
- Pletnyova, Svetlana A. *Drevnosti chernykh klobukov*. Moscow: Nauka, 1973.
- Pletnyova, Svetlana A. *Ot kocheviy k gorodam. Saltovo-mayatskaya kul'tura*. Moscow: Nauka, 1967.

- Pletnyova, Svetlana A. "Saltovo-mayatskaya kul'tura." In *Stepi Yevrazii v epokhu srednevekov'ya*, 62–75.
- Pletnyova, Svetlana A. *Kochevniki Srednevekov'ya. Poisk istoricheskikh zakonmernostey*. Moscow: Nauka, 1982.
- Pletnyova, Svetlana A. "Otnosheniya vostochnoyevropeyskikh kochevnikov s Vizantiyey i arkhologicheskiye istochniki." *SovArkh* (1991), no. 3: 98–107.
- Pletnyova, Svetlana A. "Kochevniki v Tamatarkhe." *RosArkh* (2001), no. 2: 97–107.
- Pletnyova, Svetlana A. *Kochevniki yuzhnorusskikh stepey v epokhu srednevekov'ya (IV–XIII veka)*. Voronezh: Izdatel'stvo Voronezhskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, 2003.
- Polány, István. "A nyugatmagyarországi magyar elem (lövőőrök, székelyek és besenyők) kipusztulása." *Vasi szemle* 3 (1936), no. 1–2: 36–69.
- Polgár, Szabolcs. "Kereskedelem a Fekete-tenger északi partvidékén a 9–10. században. A Ġayhāni-féle leírás adatai a magyarok és a De Administrando Imperio értesülései a besenyők kereskedelméről." In *Heves megyei régészeti közlemények. A népvándorláskor kutatóinak kilencedik konferenciája: Eger, 1998. szeptember 18–20*, vol. 2, eds. Tivadar Petercsák and Adél Váradi, 193–206. Eger: Heves Megyei Múzeumi Szervezet, 2000.
- Polgár, Szabolcs. "The identification of K.rh in the passage of Ibn Rusta." *Chronica: Annual of the Institute of History University of Szeged* 4 (2004): 15–21.
- Ponomaryov, Leonid Yu. "Stepi Kerchenskogo poluostrova vo vtoroy polovine X–XIII vv." In *Bospor Kimmeriyskiy i varvarkiyy mir v period antichnosti i srednevekov'ya. Arkheologicheskiy ob'yekt v kontekste istorii. XIV Bosporskiye chteniya*, ed. Victor N. Zin'ko, 384–91. Kerch, 2013.
- Popnedelev, Todor, (ed.). *Profesor Petŭr Mutafchiev, poznat i nepoznat*. Sofia: IF-94, 1997.
- Popov, Pavel V. "K voprosu ob etnokul'turnykh sostavlyayushchikh material'noy kul'tury oguzov i pechenegov." *Stepi Yevropy v epokhu srednevekov'ya* 9 (2012): 381–408.
- Postică, Gheorghe. "Glinyanye kotly na territorii Moldavii v rannesrednevekovyy period." *SovArkh* (1985), no. 3: 227–40.
- Postică, Gheorghe. *Civilizația medievală timpurie din spațiul pruto-nistean (secolele V–XIII)*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române, 2007.
- Postică, Gheorghe, Sava, Eugen and Agulnikov, Sergei. "Morminte ale nomazilor turanici medievali din tumulii de lângă Taraclia și Cazaclia." *Memoria Antiquitatis* 20 (1995): 141–71.
- Priselkov, Mikhail. "Russko-vizantiyskiye otnosheniya IX–XII vv." *VDI* (1939) no. 3: 98–109.
- Pritsak, Omeljan. "Stammesnamen und Titulaturen der altaischen Völker." *UAI* 24 (1952), no. 1–2: 49–104.
- Pritsak, Omeljan. "Pechenihiy." *Ukrayins'kyi istoryk* 25–27 (1970), no. 1–3: 95–101.

- Pritsak, Omeljan. "The Pečenegs. A Case of Social and Economic Transformation." *AEMAE* 1 (1975), no. 1: 211–35.
- Pritsak, Omeljan. "Polovtsi." *Ukrayins'kyi istoryk* 37–38 (1977): 112–8.
- Pritsak, Omeljan. *The Origin of Rus'*, vol. 1, *Old Scandanavian Sources Other than the Sagas*. Cambridge Mass.: Ukrainian Research Institute of Harvard University, 1981.
- Pritsak, Omeljan. "Pechenegs." In *ODB*, 3, 1613–4.
- Prokhnenko, Igor A. "Pogrebeniya kochevnikov X veka na territorii Zakarpatskoy oblasti Ukrainy: problema plemennoy atributsii." *Arkheologiya yevraziyskikh stepey* 6 (2018): 171–80.
- Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit Online. Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Nach Vorarbeiten F. Winkelmanns erstellt*, eds. Ralph-Johannes Lilie et al. Berlin/Boston, 2013.
- Prosopography of the Byzantine World, 2016*, eds. Michael Jeffreys et al. London: King's College London, 2017.
- Pryhodniuk, Oleg M. (ed.) *Materialy I tys. n.e. po arkheologii i istorii Ukrainy i Vengrii*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1996.
- Pylypchuk, Yaroslav V. "Kypchaki i Vizantiya (konets XI – nachalo XIII v.)." *Issledovaniya po istorii Vostochnoy Yevropy* 5 (2012): 41–52.
- Pylypchuk, Yaroslav V. "Etnogenez i migratsii pechenegov." *AEMAE* 23 (2017): 207–56.
- Rácz, Anita. "Népnevek és helynevek (Tézisek egy kutatási programhoz)." *Névtani értesítő* 27 (2005): 143–52.
- Rashev, Rasho. "Küsni nomadi v Pliskovskoto pole." *Preslav* 3 (1983): 242–52.
- Rashev, Rasho. "Sümnitelni i nedostoverni pametnitsi na prabŭlgarskata kultura." In *Studia protobulgarica et mediaevalia europensia. V chest na prof. V. Beshevliev*, eds. Vasul Guzelev et al., 158–74. Sofia: Tangra TanNakRa, 2003.
- Rásonyi, László. "Valacho-Turcica." In *Aus den Forschungsarbeiten der Mitglieder des Ungarischen Instituts und des Collegium Hungaricum in Berlin. Dem Andenken Robert Graggers gewidmet*, 68–96. Berlin/Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1927.
- Rásonyi, László. "Der Volksname Бепенѣу." *СК* 6 (1933): 219–26.
- Rásonyi, László. "Tuna Havzasında Kumanlar." *Belleten, Türk Tarih Kurumu* 2 (1939), no. 12: 401–22.
- Rásonyi, László. "Les Turcs non-Islamisés en Occident (Pétchéhénègues, Ouzes et Qiptchaqs et leurs Rapports avec les Hongrois)." *Philologiae Turcicae fundamenta* 3 (1970): 1–26. Reprinted in: *History of the Turkic Peoples in the pre-Islamic Period*, ed. Hans Robert Römer, 303–31. Berlin: Klaus Schwarz, 2002.
- Rásonyi, László. "Bulaqs and Oguzs in Medieval Transylvania." *Acta Orientalia ASH* 33 (1979): 129–51.
- Rásonyi, László and Baski, Imre. *Onomasticon Turcicum*. Bloomington: Sinor Research Institute of Inner Asian Studies, 2007.

- Rasovskii, Dmitrii A. "O roli Chernykh Klobukov v istorii Drevney Rusi." *SK* 1 (1927): 93–109.
- Rasovskii, Dmitrii A. "K voprosu o proiskhozhdenii Codex Cumanicus." *SK* 3 (1929): 193–214.
- Rasovskii, Dmitrii A. "Pechenegi, torki i berendei na Rusi i v Ugrii." *SK* 6 (1933): 1–64.
- Rasovskii, Dmitrii A. "Les Comans et Byzance." *Izvestiya na Bŭlgarskiya arkeologicheski institut* 9 (1935): 346–54.
- Rasovskii, Dmitrii A. "Polovtsy." *SK* 7 (1935): 245–62; 8 (1936): 161–82; 9 (1937): 71–85; 10 (1938): 155–78; 11 (1940): 95–128.
- Rasovskii, Dmitrii A. "Khinova." *SK* 8 (1936): 307–13.
- Rasovskii, Dmitrii A. "Tl'koviny." *SK* 8 (1936), 301–6.
- Rasovskii, Dmitrii A. "Rol' polovtsev v voynakh Aseney s Vizantiyskoy i Latinskoy imperiyami v 1186–1207 gg." *Spisanie na BAN* 58 (1939): 203–11.
- Rasovskii, Dmitrii A. "Rus', Chernyye Klobuki i Polovtsy v XII v." *Izvestiya na Bŭlgarskoto Istoricheskoto druzhestvo* 16–18 (1940): 369–78.
- Révész, László. "Die Gräberfelder des Komitates Heves im 10.–11. Jahrhundert." *Acta Archaeologica ASH* 59 (2008), no. 2: 457–67.
- Romančuk, Alla I. "Das mittelalterliche Cherson und die Barbaren." *BS* 54 (1993): 58–64.
- Romashov, Sergei A. "The Pechenegs in Europe in the 9th–10th Centuries." *RO* 52 (1999): 21–35.
- Róna-Tas, András. "Ethnogenese und Staatsgründung. Die türkische Komponente in der Ethnogenese des Ungartums." *Abhandlungen der Rheinisch-Westfälische Akademie der Wissenschaften* 78 (1988): 107–42.
- Róna-Tas, András. *Hungarians and Europe in the Early Middle Ages: An Introduction to Early Hungarian History*. Budapest: CEU Press, 1999.
- Runciman, Steven. *The Emperor Romanus Lecapenus and His Reign*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1963.
- Runciman, Steven. "The First Crusader's Journey across the Balcan Peninsula." *Byzantion* 19 (1949): 208–21.
- Ryabtseva, Svetlana O. "O listovidnykh ukrasheniyakh, podveskakh, kopoushkakh i reshmakh." *Revista Arheologică* 1 (2005), no. 1: 350–8.
- Samchevskii, Ivan F. "Torki, Berendei i Chernyye Klobuki." *Arkhiv istoriko-yuridicheskikh svedeniy otnosyashchikhsya do Rossii, izdavayemyy N.Kalachovym* 2, 1 (1855), no. 3: 83–106.
- Sâmpetru, Mihai. "Înmormântări pecenege din Câmpia Dunării." *SCIV* 24 (1973), no. 3: 443–68.
- Sâmpetru, Mihai. "La région du Bas – Danube au X siècle de notre ère." *Dacia* 18 (1974): 239–64.
- Sâmpetru, Mihai and Șerbănescu, Done, "Mormîntul de călăreț nomad descoperit la Curcani (jud. Ilfov)." *SCIV* 22 (1971), no. 3: 443–55.

- Savitskiĭ, Pëtr. "Step' i osedlost'." In *Rossiya mezhdru Yevropoy i Aziyey: yevraziyskiy soblazn*, 123–30.
- Savvides, Alexios. *To Vyzántio kai oi Seltzoúkoι Tourkoi ton no ai*. Athens: Domos, 1980.
- Savvides, Alexios. *Byzantium in the Near East: Its Relations with the Seljuk Sultanate of Rûm in Asia Minor, the Armenians of Cilicia and the Mongols AD c.1192–1237*. Thessaloniki: University of Thessaloniki, 1981.
- Savvides, Alexios. "O Seltzoúkos emírīs tis Smýrnis Tzachás (Čaka) kai oi epidromés tou sta mikrasiatiká parália, ta nisia tou Anatolikou Aigaiou kai tin Konstantinoúpoli, c.1081 – c.1106." *Chiaká Chroniká* 14 (1982): 9–24; 16 (1984): 51–66.
- Savvides, Alexios. "Oi Kománoi (Koumánoi) kai to Vyzántio, 1105 – 1305 ai. m.Ch." *Vyzantiná* 13 (1985): 937–57.
- Savvides, Alexios. "I teleftaía patzinakikí epidromí sto Vyzántio. 1122–1123 m.Ch." *Parnassós* 27 (1985): 493–507.
- Savvides, Alexios. "Kegénis, o Patzinákos patríkios sta méssa tou 1100 ai." In *Praktiká XIII Panellínou Istorikou Synedriou*, 143–55. Thessaloniki: Vánias, 1993.
- Savvides, Alexios. "Byzantines and the Oghuz (Ghuzz). Some Observations on the Nomenclature." *BS* 54 (1993): 147–55.
- Savvides, Alexios. *Oi Tourkoi kai to Vyzántio*, vol. 1, *Pro-othomaniká fylá stin Asía kai sta Valkánia*. Athens: Domos, 1996.
- Schamiloglu, Uli. "The Name of the Pechenegs in Ibn Hayyân's Al-muqtabas." *Journal of Turkish Studies (Turks, Hungarians and Kipchaks. A Festschrift in Honor of Tibor Halasi-Kun)* 8 (1984): 215–22.
- Schimmelpenninck van der Oye, David. *Russian Orientalism: Asia in the Russian Mind from Peter the Great to the Emigration*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010.
- Schlözer, August Ludwig. *Kritische Sammlungen zur Geschichte der Deutschen in Siebenbürgen*, vol. 2, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck-Ruprecht, 1796.
- Schlumberger, Gustave Léon. *L'épopée byzantine à la fin du dixième siècle: guerres contre les Russes, les Arabes, les Allemands, les Bulgares; luttes civiles contre les deux Bardas. Jean Tzimiscés. Les jeunes années de Basile II, le tueur de Bulgares (969–989)*. Paris: Éditions de Boccard, 1925.
- Schmit, Fëdor. "Politika i vizantinovedeniye." *Soobshcheniya Gosudarstvennoy Akademii istorii material'noy kul'tury* 7–8 (1932): 6–23.
- Schmitt, Oliver J. "Kriegsführung und tribale Gesellschaft." In *Krieg – Gesellschaft – Institutionen*, eds. Burkhard Meißner et al., 417–44. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2005.
- Schmitt, Oliver J. "Die Petschenegen auf dem Balkan von 1046 bis 1072." In *Pontos Euxeinós. Beiträge zur Archäologie und Geschichte des antiken Schwarzmeer- und Balkanraumes. Manfred Oppermann zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Sven Conrad, 473–90. Langenweissbach: Beier & Beran, 2006.
- Seibt, Werner and Zarnitz, Marie-Luise. *Das byzantinische Bleisiegel als Kunstwerk: Katalog zur Ausstellung*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1997.

- Selmeczi, László. "Régészeti ásatások a Nagykunságon." In *Zúduló sasok*, 57–66.
- Selmeczi, László. "A jászok betelepülése a régészeti leletek tükrében." In *Zúduló sasok*, 67–80.
- Senga, Toru. "A besenyők a 8. században." *Századok* 126 (1992), no. 5–6: 503–16.
- Ševčenko, Ihor. "The Date and Author of so-called Fragments of Toparcha Gothicus." *DOP* 25 (1971): 117–88.
- Ševčenko, Ihor. "Re-reading Constantine Porphyrogenitus." In *Byzantine Diplomacy. Papers from the 24th Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies (Cambridge, March 1990)*, eds. Jonathan Shepard and Simon Franklin, 167–95. Aldershot, 1992.
- Seydaliyev, Emil I. "Srednevekovoye pogrebeniye iz Tavel'skogo kurgana №5 u s. Krasnoles'ye." *MAIET* 15 (2009): 377–88.
- Shabashov, Andrii V. "Tsentral'noaziatskiye drevnosti Budzhaka (k voprosu o sootnoshenii rodoplemennogo sostava nogaytsev Budzhakskoy Ordy i gosudarstva kochevykh uzbekov)." *Lukomor'ya: arkhelohiya, etnolohiya, istoriya Pivnichno-Zakhidnoho Prychornomor'ya* 1 (2007): 114–31.
- Shalabudov, Volodymyr M. "Neopublikovannyye kochevnicheskiye pogrebeniya, otkrytyye novostroyechnymi ekspeditsiyami DGU v 1972–1999 gg." In *Problemy arkhelohiyi Podniprov'ya. Naukovyy mizhvuziv's'kyy zbirnyk z problem arkhelohiyi ta davn'oyi istoriyi*, ed. Iryna F. Kovalyova, 86–106. Dnipropetrovs'k, 2012.
- Shchepinskiĭ, Askold A. and Cherepanova, Yelena N. *Drevnosti stepnogo Kryma. Severnoye Prisivash'ye v V–I tysyacheletiyakh do n.e.* Simferopol: Izdatel'stvo "Krym," 1969.
- Shcherbak, Alexandr M. "Znaki na keramike i kirpichakh iz Sarkela – Beloy Vezhi (K voprosu o yazyke i pis'mennosti pechenegov)." In *TVDAE*, 2, 362–89.
- Shepard, Jonathan. "John Mauropus, Leo Tornicius and Alleged Russian Army: The Chronology of the Pecheneg Crisis of 1048–1049." *JÖB* 24 (1975): 61–89.
- Shepard, Jonathan. "Byzantinorussica." *RÉB* 33 (1975): 211–25.
- Shepard, Jonathan. "Byzantine Diplomacy, AD 800–1204: Means and Ends." In *Byzantine Diplomacy. Papers from the 24th Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies (Cambridge, March 1990)*, eds. Jonathan Shepard and Simon Franklin, 41–71. Aldershot: Variorum Reprints, 1992.
- Shepard, Jonathan. "A Suspected Source of Scylitzes' *Synopsis Historion*: The Great Catacalon Cecaumenus." *BMGS* 16 (1992): 171–81.
- Shepard, Jonathan. "Byzantium and the Steppe-Nomads: The Hungarian Dimension." In *Byzanz und Ostmitteleuropa 950–1453*, 55–83.
- Shepard, Jonathan. "Constantine VII's Doctrine of 'Containment' of the Rus'." In *ΓΕΝΝΑΔΙΟΣ: k 70-letiyu akademika G.G. Litavrina*, ed. Boris N. Florya, 264–83. Moscow: Indrik, 1999.
- Shepard, Jonathan. "Byzantine Writers on the Hungarians in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries." *Annual of Medieval Studies at the CEU* 10 (2004): 97–123.

- Shepard, Jonathan. "Equilibrium to Expansion (886–1025)." In *CHBE*, 493–536.
- Shepard, Jonathan. "Mingling with Northern Barbarians: Advantages and Perils." In *The Steppe Lands and the World beyond Them*, 219–234.
- Shmaglii, Mykola M. and Chernyakov, Ivan T. "Issledovaniya kurganov v stepnoy chasti mezhdurech'ya Dunaya i Dnestra (1964–1966 gg.)." In *Kurgany stepnoy chasti mezhdurech'ya Dunaya i Dnestra (Materialy po arkheologii Severnogo Prichernomor'ya)*, issue 6, *Trudy Dnepro-Dunayskoy novostroyechnoy ekspeditsii 1963–1967 gg.*, part 1, ed. Petro O. Karyshkovskii, 5–115. Odessa: Mayak, 1970.
- Shukurov, Rustam M. "Zemli i plemena: vizantiyskaya klassifikatsiya tyurok." *VizVrem* 69 (2010): 132–63.
- Sinica, Vitalii, Razumov, Sergeï and Telnov, Nikolaï. *Kurgany u sela Butory*. Tiraspol: Pridnestrovskiy gosudarstvennyy universitet im. T.G. Shevchenko, 2013.
- Sinor, Denis. "Horse and Pasture in Inner Asian History." In *Inner Asia and its Contacts with Medieval Europe*, 171–83. London: Variorum Reprints, 1977.
- Skabalanovich, Nikolaï. *Vizantiyskoye gosudarstvo i tserkov' v XI vèkè*. Saint Petersburg: Tipografiya F. Yeleonskogo i K<sup>o</sup>, 1884.
- Sorochan, Sergii B. *Vizantiyskiy Kherson (vtoraya pol. VI–pervaya pol. X vv.)*. *Ocherki istorii i kul'tury*, 2 vols. Kharkiv: Maydan, 2005.
- Sorochan, Sergii B. "Vizantiyskiy Kherson v pis'makh Nikolaya Mistika." *KhazarSKIY al'manakh* 10 (2012): 179–201.
- Soustal, Peter. *Thrakien (Thrakè, Rodopè und Haimimontos)*. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1991.
- Spinei, Victor. "Découvertes de l'étape tardive des migrations à Todireni (dép. de Botoşani)." *Dacia* 17 (1973): 277–92.
- Spinei, Victor. "Antichitățile nomazilor turanici din Moldova în primul sfert al mileniului al II-lea." *SCIVA* 25 (1974), no. 3, 389–416.
- Spinei, Victor. "Relations of the local population of Moldavia with the nomad Turanian tribes in the 10th–13th centuries." In *Relations between the autochthonous*, 265–76.
- Spinei, Victor. "Considerații cu privire la populația locală din zona centrală și meridională a Moldovei în secolele XI–XII." *Cercetări Istorice* 12–13 (1981–1982): 172–203.
- Spinei, Victor. *Moldavia in the 11th–14th Centuries*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1986.
- Spinei, Victor. *The Great Migrations in the East and South East of Europe from the Ninth to the Thirteenth Century*. Cluj-Napoca: Istros Publishing House, 2003.
- Spinei, Victor. "The Cumanic Bishopric – Genesis and Evolution." In *The Other Europe*, 413–56.
- Spinei, Victor. *The Romanians and the Turkic Nomads North of the Danube Delta from the Tenth to the Mid-Thirteenth Century*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2009.

- Spitsyn, Alexandr A. "Kurgany kiyevskikh torkov i berendeyev." *Zapiski Imperatorskago Russkago arkeologicheskogo obshchestva* 11 (1899), no. 1–2: 156–60.
- Spitsyn, Alexandr A. "Tatarskiye kurgany." *Izvestiya Tavricheskogo Obshchestva Istorii, Arkeologii i Etnografii* 1 (58) (1927): 149–53.
- Spitsyn, Alexandr A. "Moi nauchnyya raboty." *SK* 2 (1928): 331–46.
- Stănescu, Eugen. "Beiträge zur Paristrion-Frage. Die Benennungen der unteren Donaugebiete im 10 bis 12 Jahrhundert als historisches Problem." *JÖB* 17 (1968): 41–64.
- Stănescu, Eugen. "Denumirile bizantine ale regiunii de la Dunărea de Jos în secolele X–XII și sensul lor istoric." *SCIV* 19 (1968), no. 3: 469–91.
- Stănescu, Eugen. "Les "Mixobarbares" du Bas-Danube au XIe siècle. (Quelques problèmes de la terminologie des textes)." In *Nouvelles études d'histoire*, vol. 3, *Publiées à l'occasion du XIIe Congrès des Sciences historiques, Vienne*, 45–53. Bucharest: Editions de l'Académie de la République socialiste de Roumanie, 1965.
- Stănescu, Eugen. "La crise du Bas-Danube byzantin au cours de la seconde moitié du XIe siècle." *ZRVI* 9 (1966): 49–73.
- Stanev, Kamen. "Vüzstanovyavaneto na vizantiiskata vlast v Paristrion prez 1059 g. i proizkhoda na imeto Nikopol." *Minalo* (2003), no. 3: 19–24.
- Stanev, Kamen. "Migratsiya ot Trakiya kŭm Severna Bŭlgariya v kraya na XII – nachaloto na XIII vek i neinite posleditsi." In *Srednovkovniyat bŭlgarin i "drugite"*. *Sbornik v chest na 60-godishninata na prof. din Petŭr Angelov*, eds. Angel Nikolov and Georgi Nikolov, 208–17. Sofia: Universitetsko izdatelstvo "Sv. Kliment Okhridski," 2013.
- Stanilov, Stanislav. "Polovin zvŭnets (prinos kŭm prouchvaneto na starobŭlgarskite zvŭnyashti amuleti ot VII–XI v.)." In *Bŭlgarskite zemi prez srednekovieto (VII–XVII v.)*. *Mezhdunarodna konferentsiya v chest na 70-godishninata na prof. Aleksandŭr Kuzev*, eds. Valeri Ūotov and Plamen Pavlov, 29–40. Varna: Arkeologicheski muzei, Varna, 2005.
- Ștefan, Gheorghe. "Dinogetia, I. Risultati della prima campagna di scavi." *Dacia* 7–8 (1937–1940): 401–25.
- Ștefan, Gheorghe, Barnea, Ion, Comșa, Maria and Comșa, Eugen. *Dinogetia*, vol. 1, *Așezarea feudală timpurie de la Bisericuța-Garvăn*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1967.
- Stepanenko, Valerii P. and Mokhov, Anton S. "Balkanskiy etap kar'yery Vasila, syna Apukhapa." *VizVrem* 67 (2008): 63–75.
- Stephenson, Paul. "Byzantine Policy towards Paristrion in the Mid-Eleventh Century: Another Interpretation." *BMGS* 23 (1999): 43–66.
- Stephenson, Paul. *Byzantium's Balkan Frontier. A Political Study of the Northern Balkans, 900–1204*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Stephenson, Paul. "The Balkan Frontier in the Year 1000." In *Byzantium in the Year 1000*, ed. Paul Magdalino, 95–133. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2003.



- Stephenson, Paul. "Balkan Borderlands (1018–1204)." In *CHBE*, 664–91.
- Stolyaryk, Olena S. "Klad monet imperatora Nikifora III Votaniata iz s. Făurești." In *Arkheologicheskiye issledovaniya*, 137–40.
- Stolyaryk, Olena S. *Ocherki monetnoy obrashcheniya Severo-Zapadnogo Prichernomor'ya v pozdnerimskoye i vizantiyskoye vremya (konets III – nachalo XIII v.)*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1992.
- Stoyanov, Valeri. *Istoriya na izuchavaneto na Codex Cumanicus. Kumano-pechenezhki antroponimi v Bŭlgariya prez XV vek*. Sofia: Ogledalo, 2000.
- Stoyanov, Valeri. "Kumans in Bulgarian History (Eleventh – Fourteenth Centuries)." In *The Turks*, 680–9.
- Stoyanov, Valeri. *Kumanologiya. Opiti za rekonstruktsiya*. Sofia: Akademichno izdatelstvo "Prof. Marin Drinov," 2006.
- Stoyanov, Valeri. *Kumanologiya: Istoriografski eskizi*, 2 vols. Sofia: Institut po istoriya pri BAN, 2009.
- Stoyanov, Valeri. "Die russische Historiographie über die *Kočevniki* – ein Beitrag zur Ideengeschichte des späten Zarenreichs." *BHR* 40 (2010), no. 3–4: 167–92.
- Strässle, Paul. M. "Das Feindbild der Petschenegen im Byzanz der Komnenen (11./12. Jh.)." *BF* 28 (2004): 297–313.
- Suceveanu, Alexandru. "Un mormînt din secolul XI e.n. la Histria." *SCIV* 24 (1973), no. 3: 495–502.
- Suhm, Peter-Frederik. "Abhandlung von den Uzen oder Polowzern." In *Des heiligen Nestors, Mönnichs im Petscherischen Kloster des heiligen Theodosius in Kiew, und der Fortsetzer desselben älteste Jahrbücher der Russischen Geschichte: vom Jahre 858 bis zum Jahre 1203*, vol. 4, ed. Johann-Benedikt Scherer, 271–310. Leipzig: Bernhard Christoph Breitkopf und Sohn, 1774.
- Suhm, Peter-Frederik. "Istorieskoye razsuzhdenie o Patsinakakh" ili Pechenëgakh." *Chteniya v "Imperatorskom" Obshchestve Istorii i Drevnostey Rossiyskikh" pri Moskovskom" Universitete* 2 (1846), no. 1: 1–48.
- Sümer, Faruk. "Bayındır, Peçenek ve Yüreğirler." *Ankara Üniversitesi Dilve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi* 11 (1953), no. 2–4: 317–44.
- Sümer, Faruk. *Oğuzlar (Türkmenler): Tarihleri – Boy Teşkilâtı – Destanları*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi, 1972.
- Szabó, János B. "Magrebiták, Úzok – Kunok, Berendek és Besenyók. Egy XII. századi keleti betelepülés nyomában." *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények* 129 (2016), no. 1: 148–59.
- Szegfű, László. "Megjegyzések Thonuzoba históriájához." *Századok* (1982), no. 5: 1060–78.
- Szmoniewski, Bartłomiej-Szymon and Voinea, Valentina. "Pogrebeniye tyurkskogo kochevnika, otkrytoye v peshchere Baba v Sredney Dobrudzhe v Rumynii." *Stratum Plus* (2011), no. 5: 287–96.

- Szokolay, Margit. "A magyarországi besenyőtelepekről." *Föld és Ember* 9 (1929), no. 2: 65–90.
- Takács, Miklós. *Die arpadenzeitlichen Tonkessel im Karpatenbecken*. Budapest: Institut für Archäologie der Ungarischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1986.
- Tanașoca, Nicolae-Șerban. "Les Mixobarbares et les formations politiques paristriennes du XIe siècle." *RRH* (1973), no. 1: 61–82.
- Tentiuc, Ion. "Despre pandantivele de călăreți din perioada medievală timpurie în spațiul pruto-nistrean." *Tyragetia* 4 (19) (2010), no. 1: 225–33.
- Tentiuc, Ion. *Populația din Moldova centrală în secolele XI–XIII*. Iași: Helios, 1996.
- Teodor, Dan. "Cîteva observații în legătura cu căldările de lut descoperite la Răducăneni (r. Huși, reg. Iași)." *SCIV* 14 (1963), no. 1: 197–205.
- Theodorescu, Răzvan. *Bizant, Balcani, Occident la începuturile culturii medievale Românești (secolele X–XIV)*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1974.
- Titov, Valerii S. and Erdélyi István (eds.) *Arkheologiya Vengrii. Konets II tysyacheletiya do n.e. – I tysyacheletiya n.e.* Moscow: Nauka, 1986.
- Tivchev, Petür. "Za uchastiето na búlgari vŭv vizantiiskata voiska prez perioda na vizantiiskoto igo (1018–1185 gg.)." *IstPreg* (1963), no. 1: 79–93.
- Todorov, Boris. "The Value of Empire: Tenth-Century Bulgaria between Magyars, Pechenegs and Byzantium." *Journal of Medieval History* 36 (2010) no. 4: 312–26.
- Todorov, Georgi. "Vŭnshniyat grad na Pliska prez XI vek." *Zhurnal za istoricheski i arkheologicheski izsledvaniya* (2019), no. 1: 66–80.
- Tolochko, Olexsii P. "Istoriya Rossiyskaya" *Vasiliya Tatishcheva: istochniki i izvestiya*. Kyiv: Krytyka, 2005.
- Tolstov, Sergei P. "Goroda guzov (istoriko-etnograficheskiye etyudy)." *SovEthn* (1947), no. 3: 55–102.
- Tolstov, Sergei P. *Po sledam drevnekhorezmiyskoy tsivilizatsii*. Moscow/Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1948.
- Tomaschek, Wilhelm. "Zur Kunde der Hämus-Halbinsel: topographische, archäologische und ethnologische Miscellen." *Sitzungsberichte der Philologisch-Historische Klasse der Wiener Akademie der Wissenschaften* 99 (1882): 437–507; "Zur Kunde der Hämus-Halbinsel (II): Die Handelswege im 12. Jahrhundert nach den Erkundigungen des Arabers Idrisi." *Sitzungsberichte der Philologisch-Historische Klasse der Wiener Akademie der Wissenschaften* 113 (1887): 285–373.
- Tonchev, Alexandr. "Svedeniya za búlgarskata istoriya v 'Aleksiada' na Anna Komnina." *IstPreg* (1970), no. 5: 123–38.
- Tortika, Olexandr O. "Sredniye razmery stada kak osnovnoy ekologicheskoy, ekonomicheskoy i sotsial'noy pokazatel' traditsionnogo kochevogo obshchestva." *Aktual'ni problemy vitchyznyanoyi ta vsesvitn'oyi istoriyi* 3 (1998): 168–74.
- Tortika, Olexandr O. "Ekologicheski vozmozhnaya chislennost' kochevogo naseleniya Velikoy Bolgarii (Staroy Bolgarii, Bolgarii Kubrata) – vtoraya-tret'ya

- chetvert' VII v. n.e." In *Sugdeya, Surozh, Soldayya v istorii i kul'ture Rusi-Ukrainy*, ed. Nelya M. Kukoval's'ka, 249–52. Kyiv/Sudak: Akadempriodyka, 2002.
- Tortika, Olexandr O. *Severo-Zapadnaya Khazariya v kontekste istorii Vostochnoy Yevropy (vtoraya polovina VII – pervaya chetvert' X v.)*. Kharkiv: Kharkivs'ka derzhavna akademiya kul'tury, 2006.
- Tortika, Olexandr O., Mikheyev, Volodymyr K. and Kortiyev, Roman N. "Nekotoryye ekologo-demograficheskiye i sotsial'nyye aspekty istorii kochevykh obshchestv." *EthnOboz* (1994), no. 1: 49–61.
- Tóser, Márton. "Kétfrontos harc: Bizánc és a besenyő és szeldzsuk támadások a XI. század közepén." *Hadtörténelmi közlemények* (2015), no. 1: 120–45.
- Totev, Boyan and Pelevina, Olga. "Rannesrednekovyye zerkala iz basseyna Nizhnego Dunaya." In *Istochniki po istorii kochevnikov*, 79–81.
- Totev, Totyu. "Za kumani v edin nadpis ot Preslav." In *Kulturata na srednekovniya Turnov*, ed. Atanas Popov and Velizar Velkov, 158–69. Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bŭlgarskata akademiya na naukite, 1985.
- Tóth, Péter E. "A besenyő betelepülés helynévi emléke." *Archivum Supplementum ad honorem Béla Kovács dedicatum – A Heves Megyei Levéltár közleményei, különszám*, 247–59. Eger, 1993.
- Trubetskoĭ, Nikolai S. "O turanskom elemente v russkoy kul'ture." *EthnOboz* (1992), no. 1: 92–106.
- Tryjarski, Edward. "Les religions des Petchenègues." In *Traditions religieuses et para-religieuses des peuples altaïques. Communications présentées au XIIIe Congrès de la "Permanent International Altaistic Conference", Strasbourg, 25–30 juin 1970*, 139–48. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1972.
- Tryjarski, Edward. "Pieczyngowie." In Dąbrowski, Krzysztof, Nagrodzka-Majchrzyk, Teresa and Tryjarski, Edward. *Hunowie Europejscy, Protobułgarzy, Chazarowie, Pieczyngowie*, 479–625. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1975.
- Tryjarski, Edward. *Zwyczaje pogrzebowe ludów tureckich na tle ich wierzeń*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 1991.
- Tŭpkova-Zaimova, Vasilka. "Rolyata i administrativna organizatsiya na t. nar. 'Otvŭddunavska Bŭlgariya.'" In *Studia Balcanica* 2 (1970), 63–96.
- Tŭpkova-Zaimova, Vasilka. "L'administration byzantine au Bas-Danube (fin du Xe–XIe s.). Tentative d'une mise au point." *ÉB* 3 (1973): 90–112.
- Tŭpkova-Zaimova, Vasilka. *Dolni Dunav – granichna zona na Vizantijskiya zapad: Kŭm istoriyata na severnite i severoiztochnite bŭlgarski zemi, kraya na X–XII v.* Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bŭlgarskata akademiya na naukite, 1976.
- Tŭpkova-Zaimova, Vasilka. "Tyurkskiye kochevniki, vizantiyskaya administratsiya i mestnoye naseleniye na Nizhnem Dunaye (XI–XII vv.)." In *Vostochnaya Yevropa v drevnosti i srednekov'ye*, ed. Lev V. Cherepnin, 67–73. Moscow: Nauka, 1978.
- Tŭpkova-Zaimova, Vasilka. "Dolni Dunav – limes i limen mezhdū Vizantiya i slavyanskiya svyat." In *Rusko-bŭlgarski vrŭzki*, 39–45.

- Tüpkova-Zaimova, Vasilka. "Migrations frontalières en Bulgarie médiévale." In *Migrations et diasporas méditerranéennes: (Xe–XVIe siècles). Actes du colloque de Conques (octobre 1999)*, eds. Michel Balard and Alain Ducellier, 125–31. Paris: Éditions de la Sorbonne, 2002.
- Tüpkova-Zaimova, Vasilka and Stoimenov, Dimitür. "Otnovo na Dolni Dunav (kraya na X–XI v.). Istoriografski i izvorovedski problemi." In *Cherno more mezhdú iztoka i zapada. Reka Dunav: most mezhdú narodi i kulturi. IX Pontüskie chteniya, Varna, 16-17 maí 2003*, eds. Snezhka Panova et al., 341–8. Varna: ASI, 2004.
- Türk, Attila. "Towards a Classification of Grave Types and Burial Rites in the 10th–11th Century Carpathian Basin. Some Remarks and Observations." In *Avars, Bulgars and Magyars*, 137–56.
- Udaltsova, Zinaida V. *Sovetskoye vizantinovedeniye za 50 let*. Moscow: Nauka, 1969.
- Uray-Kóhalmi, Käthe. "Über die Pfeifenden Pfeile der innerasiatischen Reiternomaden." *Acta Orientalia ASH* 3 (1953): 45–71.
- Uray-Kóhalmi, Käthe. *A steppék nomádja lóháton, fegyverben*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1982.
- Uspenskii, Födor. *Obrazovaniye vtorago Bolgarskago tsarstva*. Odessa, 1879.
- Uspenskii, Födor. "Akademik Vasiliy Grigoriyevich Vasil'yevskiy. (Obzor glavneyshikh trudov yego po izucheniyu Vizantii)." *ZhMNP* 325 (1899), no. 10: 291–342.
- Uspenskii, Födor. *Istoriya krestovyykh pokhodov*. Saint Petersburg: Tipografiya AO Brokgauz-Yefron, 1901.
- Uspenskii, Födor. "Dvizheniye narodov iz Tsentral'noy Azii v Yevropu. I. Turki. II. Mongoly." *VizVrem* 1 (1947): 9–28.
- Uspenskii, Födor. *Istoriya Vizantiyskoy imperii*, vol. 3. Moscow/Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk sssr, 1948.
- Uzelac, Alexandar. "Kumanite v srednovekovna Sürbiya." *Anamneza* 3 (2008), no. 1: 163–79.
- Uzelac, Alexandar. "Skitski razbojnici u Bugarskoj pustinji. Pogled jednog hodočasnika na Pomoravlje sredinom XI veka." *Istorijski časopis* 59 (2010): 59–75.
- Uzelac, Alexandar. "Zapadnite püteshestvenitsi v 'Deserta Bulgariae' predi Pürviya krüstonosen pokhod." *Epokhi* 25 (2017), no. 1: 196–202.
- Valeriev, İoto. "The Dristra battle (1087)." *Cultura și civilizație la Dunărea de Jos* 24 (2008): 257–67.
- Valeriev, İoto. "The Treasure of Golden Byzantine Coins from Professor Ishirkovo, Silistra Region." *Pontica* 42 (2009): 653–61.
- Valeriev, İoto. "Küm istoriyata i arkeologiyata na zemite na Dolniya Dunav prez Srednovekovieto: sbornite monetni nakhodki ot teritoriyata na Bülğariya, Sürbiya i Rumüniya (969–1180)." *Dobrudzha* 24–25 (2013): 381–460.
- Valeriev, İoto. "Oshte za vizantiisko-kumanskata voına ot 1148 g." *Pütuvane küm Bülğariya* 3 (2014): 417–30.

- Valeriev, Īoto. "Srednovekovni bronzovi amuleti konnitsi na Dolniya Dunav (XI–XII v.)." *Dobrudzha* 30 (2015): 375–400.
- Valeriev, Īoto. *Bŭlgarskite zemi i nashestviyata na kŭsnite nomadi v kraya na XI–XII v.* [Ph.D. thesis]. Sofia, 2015.
- Valeriev, Īoto. "Kŭsnonomadski pandantivi amuleti ot raŭona na Dolniya Dunav." In *V poiskakh sushchnosti: Sbornik statey v chest' 60-letiya N.D. Russeva*, eds. Mark Tkachuk and Georgi Atanasov, 125–145. Chiŭinaŭ: Stratum Plus, 2019.
- Valeriev, Īoto and Nikolov, N. "Pokhodŭt na Aleksii I Komnin kŭm Drŭstŭr (1087 g.) Novi dannii i interpretatsiya." *Pŭtuvane kŭm Bŭlgariya 1* (2009): 432–47.
- Vásáry, István. *Cumans and Tatars. Oriental Military in the pre-Ottoman Balkans, 1186–1365*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Vasiliev, Alexandr. *Lektsii po istorii Vizantii*, vol. 1, *Vremya do Krestovyykh pokhodov (do 1081 goda)*. Petrograd: Tipografiya Ya. Bashmakov i K<sup>o</sup>, 1917.
- Vasiliev, Alexandr. *Vizantiya i krestonostsy. Epokha Komninov (1081–1185) i Angelov (1185–1204)*. Petrograd, 1923.
- Vasiliev, Alexandr. *The Goths in the Crimea*. Cambridge, Mass.: The Mediaeval Academy of America 1936.
- Vasilievskii, Vasiliĭ G. "Vizantiya i pechenĕgi (1048–1094)." *ZhMNP* 164 (1872), no. 11: 116–165; 164 (1872), no. 12: 243–332. Reprint in: *Trudy V.G. Vasil'yevskago*, vol. 1, 1–175. Saint Petersburg: Izdaniye Imperatorskoy Akademii nauk, 1908.
- Vasilievskii, Vasiliĭ G. "Dva pis'ma vizantiyskogo imperatora Mikhaila VII Duki k Vsevolodu Yaroslavovichu." In *Trudy V.G. Vasil'yevskago*, vol. 2, 3–55. Saint Petersburg: Izdaniye Imperatorskoy Akademii nauk, 1909.
- Vasilievskii, Vasiliĭ G. "Russko-vizantiyskiye issledovaniya: Zhitiya svv. Georgiya Amastridskogo i Stefana Surozhskogo." In *Trudy V.G. Vasil'yevskago*, vol. 3. Petrograd: Izdaniye Imperatorskoy Akademii nauk, 1915.
- Velikanova, Marina S. "Dannyye paleoantropologii o peremeshchenii naseleniya v Dnestrovsko-prutskom mezhdurech'ye v I–II tysyacheletiyakh." In *Slavyanovoloshskiy svyazi*, ed. Nikolai A. Mokhov, 30–46. Kishinev: Shtiintsa, 1978.
- Vernadsky, George. "Mongol'skoye igo v russkoy istorii." *Yevraziyskiy vremennik* 5 (1927): 153–64.
- Vernadsky, George. "The Rus' in the Crimea and the Russo-Byzantine Treaty of 945." *Byzantina-Metabyzantina: A Journal of Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 1 (1946), no. 1: 249–60.
- Vladimirov, Georgi. "Ser'gi v vide znaka voprosa iz Dunayskoy Bolgarii (XIII–XIV vv.): proiskhozhdeniye i areal rasprostraneniya." *Povolzhskaya Arkheologiya* 7 (2014), no. 1: 224–33.
- Vladimirov, Georgi. "Material'nyye sledy kumanov v Bolgarskikh zemlyakh (konets XI – seredina XIII v.): problemy izucheniya." *Povolzhskaya Arkheologiya* 9 (2014), no. 3: 242–55.

- Vörös, Gábor. "Relics of the Pecheneg Language in the Works of Constantine." In *The Turks*, 617–31.
- Vuitch, Lidiya G. "Antropologicheskaya kharakteristika cherepov iz rannikh pogrebeniy Sarkela." In *TVDAE*, 3, 282–94.
- Vuitch, Lidiya G. "Cherepa iz kochevnicheskogo mogil'nika vozle Sarkela – Beloy Vezhi." In *TVDAE*, 3, 420–45.
- Vüzharova, Zhivka. "Slavyani i nomadi na teritoriyata na dneshnite búlgarski zemi ot kraia na VI–XI v." *Pliska-Preslav* 3 (1981), 16–65.
- Wirth, Peter. "Die Bevölkerungspolitik der Komnenen- und Laskaridenkaiser." *BF* 7 (1979): 203–12.
- Wozniak, Frank E. "Byzantine Policy on the Black Sea or Russian Steppe in the Late 830's." *Byzantine Studies/Études byzantines* 2 (1975): 56–62.
- Wozniak, Frank E. "The Crimean Question, the Black Bulgarians, and the Russo-Byzantine Treaty of 944." *Journal of Medieval History* 5 (1979), no. 2: 115–26.
- Wozniak, Frank E. "Byzantium, the Pechenegs and the Rus': The Limitations of a Great Power's Influence on its Clients in the 10th Century Eurasian Steppe." *AEMAE* 4 (1984): 299–316.
- Yakobson, Anatolii L. *Srednevekovyy Khersones (XII–XIV vv.)*. Moscow/Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1950.
- Yakobson, Anatolii L. *Rannesrednevekovyy Khersones*. Moscow/Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1959.
- Yanin, Valentin L. and Litavrin, Gennadii G. "Nekotoryye problemy russko-vizantiyskikh otnosheniy v IX–XV vv." *Istoriya SSSR* (1970), no. 4: 32–53.
- Yurasov, Mikhail K. "Neslavyanskiye narody Vostochnoy Yevropy v 'deyaniyakh Vengrov' neizvestnogo notariya korolya Bely III." *Istoriya. Vestnik Nizhegorodskogo universiteta im. N.I. Lobachevskogo* (2015), no. 2: 71–8.
- Zaborov, Mikhail A. "Krestovyye pokhody v russkoy burzhuaznoy istoriografii." *VizVrem* 4 (1951): 171–90.
- Zaborov, Mikhail A. "Krestovyye pokhody v russkoy istoriografii posledney trety XIX v." *VizVrem* 22 (1963): 227–59.
- Zaborov, Mikhail A. "Iz istorii izucheniya krestovyykh pokhodov v otechestvennoy medievistike. ("Krestovyye pokhody". Kurs lektsiy O.A. Dobiash-Rozhdestvenskoy)." In *Istoriya i istoriki. Istoriografiya vseobshchey istorii*, eds. Mikhail A. Alpatov et al., 344–59. Moscow: Nauka, 1966.
- Zaborov, Mikhail A. *Istoriografiya krestovyykh pokhodov (XV–XIX vv.)*. Moscow: Nauka, 1971.
- Zatyrkovich, Mikhail. *O vliyanií bor'by mezhdu narodami i sosloviyami na obrazovanie stroya russkogo gosudarstva v" domongol'skiy period"*. Moscow: Izdaniye Imperatorskogo obshchestva istorii i drevnostey rossiyskikh pri Moskovskom universitete, 1874.

- Zhalmenova, Olga P. "U istokov rossiyskogo sredoziatovedeniya: nauchno-pedagogicheskaya deyatel'nost' V.V. Bartol'da." *Stavropol'skiy al'manakh Obshchestva intelektual'noy istorii* (2003), no. 3: 158–74.
- Zhekova, Zhenya. "Parichni plashtaniya na Vizantiya, svürzani s bitkata pri Akheloi." In *Simeonova Bülğariya*, 107–17.
- Zimonyi, István. "Az eurázsiai steppe nomádjai és szomszédai." *Acta Historica* 99 (1995): 65–5.
- Zimonyi, István. "A besenyők nyugatra vándorlásának okai." *Acta Historica* 106 (1998): 129–44.
- Zimonyi, István. "The Chapter of the Jayhānī-tradition on the Pechenegs." In *The Steppe Lands and the World beyond Them*, 99–113.
- Zimonyi, István. "The State of the Research on the Prehistory of the Hungarians. Historiography (Oriental Sources, History of the Steppe)." In *Research on the Prehistory of the Hungarians*, 87–102.
- Zimonyi, István. *Muslim Sources on the Magyars in the Second Half of the 9th Century. The Magyar Chapter of the Jayhānī Tradition*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2015.
- Zlatarski, Vasil. *Istoriya na bülğarskata dürzhava prez Srednite vekove*, vol. 2, *Bülğariya pod Vizantiisko vladichestvo* (1018–1187). Sofia: Dürzhavna pechatnitsa, 1934.
- Zlatarski, Vasil. "Kaküv narod se razbira u Ana Komnina pod izraza γένος τι Σκυθικόν." In *Izbrani proizvedeniya*, 2, 230–9.
- Zorin, Andrei I. *Kormya dvuglavogo orla ... Literatura i gosudarstvennaya ideologiya v Rossii v posledney treti XVIII – pervoy treti XIX veka*. Moscow: Novoye literaturnoye obozreniye, 2004.
- Zuckerman, Constantin. "Les Hongrois au pays de Lebedia: Une nouvelle puissance aux confins de Byzance et de la Khazarie ca 836–889." In *To empólemo Vyzántio (905–1205 ai.)*, ed. Kóstas Tsiknakis, 51–74. Athens: Goulandri-Horn Foundation, 1997. In Russian: "Vengry v strane Levedii: novaya derzhava na granitsakh Vizantii i Khazarii ok. 836–889 g." *MAIET* 6 (1998): 663–88.
- Zyablin, Leonid P. *Arkheologicheskiye pamyatniki kochevnikov X–XIV vv. Vostochnoy Yevropy* [Candidate's Thesis]. Moscow, 1952.
- Zyablin, Leonid P. "O 'tatarskikh' kurganakh." *SovArkh* 22 (1955): 83–96.

# Index of Geographic and Ethnic Names

- Acheloos, river 155, 170, 288, 300, 302  
Adamclisi 100  
Adrianople 64  
Al-Andalus (Iberian Peninsula) 186  
Alans 91, 93, 187, 193, 231, 243, 269, 311, 319.  
    *See also* Iasians; Jászok  
Albania 180  
Albanians 239  
Algiers 46  
Alma, river 27  
Alps 190  
Altai 310  
Altaic peoples 312–13, 317  
Aluston 232  
Amsterdam 279  
Ananyiv 210  
Anatolia 2, 40, 186, 315. *See also* Asia Minor  
Anglo-Saxons 165  
Arab Caliphate 258  
Arabs 181, 236  
Aral Sea 190, 314  
Arcadiopolis 173  
Argeş, river 85  
Armenians 239, 243, 271  
Asia 19, 187  
    Central 28, 53, 78, 187, 213, 258, 310–11, 318  
    Inner 317  
Asia Minor 10, 58, 185, 296, 308, 315, 321. *See also* Anatolia  
Astrakhan 15  
‘SY, people from the Schechter Letter 319  
Atel (Itil) 282, 312  
Atelkuz (Ἀτελκοῦζου) 31, 77, 272, 299  
Athens 116, 136, 165, 274, 286  
Austria 1, 15  
Austria-Hungary 265  
Avars 70, 94, 144, 173, 293, 319  
Azerbaijani 252  
Azov (Sea of Azov), Azov region 223, 226, 232, 301  
  
Babei 216  
Bä-čän-äk, Bacanäk 52. *See also* Pechenegs  
Bachkovo 245  
Bahate 216  
  
Bajanakiya 315. *See also* Patzinakia  
Bakhchysarai 7  
Baku 253  
Bala Becenek 40  
Balaton, lake 91  
Balchik 144, 146, 157  
Balkans (Balkan Peninsula) 1, 2, 5, 24, 28, 39–41, 45, 47, 48, 52, 57, 68, 78, 113, 116, 132–33, 135, 143, 147, 157, 160, 163, 165–67, 176–77, 180, 184–85, 187–88, 204, 217, 234, 239–40, 250, 265, 271, 281, 290, 292, 298, 304, 306, 309–10, 312, 315–16, 323, 325–26, 328  
Banat 36, 118, 121, 130–31  
Baqla 232  
Basarabi 253. *See also* Murfatlar  
Bashkortostan 204  
Basques 6  
Bdintsi 146  
Becenek 40  
Becenek Boğazi 40  
Beğenäk, al- 187. *See also* Pechenegs  
Belgrade 5, 48, 157, 183–84  
Bender 210  
Berendei 56, 196  
Berlin 69, 74, 95, 265, 324  
Beroe (Ostrov, Tulcea County) 127  
Beroia (Stara Zagora) 5, 179  
Besenyő(k)/Bisseni 31, 84. *See also* Pechenegs  
Bessarabia 27, 73, 221  
Biçenak, village 255  
Bilbao 6  
Blachernae (suburb in the northwestern section of Constantinople) 285  
Black Bulgars 301, 319  
Black Hoods (Qaraqalpaq) 196, 314  
Black Sea (Πόντος Ἐϋξεινος) 1, 16, 23, 30, 62, 71, 81, 83, 84, 98, 130, 155–56, 164–65, 169, 186, 190–91, 251, 256, 268–69, 283, 289, 298, 315, 321  
    Straits 7, 15, 16, 24. *See also* Bosphorus Strait; Dardanelles  
Blaj 44  
Blökumannaland 38



- BM, people from the Schechter Letter 319  
 Bolhrad 210  
 Bolshoy Uzen, river 204  
 Bonn 66  
 Bosnia 183–84, 187  
 Bosphoros, Bosphorus (Medieval Greek name for Kerch) 222, 232–33  
 Bosphorus Strait 323  
 Brăila 121  
 Brănești, village 218  
 Branichevo (Viminacium, Βρανίτζοβα) 157, 183  
 British Commonwealth 268  
 British Isles 306  
 Brussels 265  
 Bucharest 47, 96, 102, 111, 121, 127, 130, 136, 168, 267, 269, 270, 324  
 Budapest 29, 32, 35, 69, 77, 276  
 Budjak, historical region 209, 212, 216, 254  
 Northern Bukovyna 73  
 Bulaqs 79  
 Bulgaria, Bulgarian Empire, Asen state, medieval state 1, 18, 23, 41, 47, 49, 50–52, 55, 67, 68, 95, 110, 133, 137, 161–63, 167, 170, 172–74, 176, 181, 189, 236–39, 264, 283, 288, 305, 326. *See also* First Bulgarian Empire; Second Bulgarian Empire  
 Bulgaria, Βουλγαρία (theme) 4, 46, 47, 107, 127, 129, 154, 157  
 Bulgaria, present day state 5, 20, 33, 41, 71, 73, 74, 88, 89, 104–5, 126, 132, 134, 136–38, 142–46, 148–49, 153, 155, 157, 159, 165, 207, 217, 235, 265, 324  
 Bulgarians, Bulgarian people 7, 43, 49–52, 70, 74, 102, 137–38, 162, 165–66, 169, 173, 177, 189, 212, 239, 271, 288, 290, 292–93, 319, 326  
 Bulgars 28, 70, 137, 181, 187, 193, 317, 319. *See also* Proto-Bulgarians  
 Burgas 150  
 Burtas 81  
 Buryat-Mongols 260  
 Buzău 121  
 Byzantine Empire (Byzantium, Rūma, ar-Rūm) 2, 4–20, 23, 24, 35, 38, 40, 44–50, 52–55, 57, 59, 60, 62, 63, 65, 66, 68–72, 76, 79, 83, 84, 87, 88, 92, 94, 100, 103, 107–8, 111–13, 115–16, 120, 126–27, 129–33, 136–37, 163–69, 172–74, 176–82, 184–85, 187–88, 190–91, 196, 198, 204, 217–19, 223–25, 230, 232, 235–40, 242–43, 245–47, 250, 256, 261, 264–75, 278, 284–85, 288–90, 292, 294, 298, 301–5, 307–8, 312–13, 315–16, 318–19, 323–28  
 Byzantines 102, 116, 179, 242, 251, 271, 285, 287, 291, 293, 295–96, 299, 305, 309. *See also* Rhomaioi; Romans  
 Çabi, village 255  
 Cahul 210  
 Călărași 121  
 Callatis (Mangalia) 103  
 Cambridge 269, 284, 290, 317  
 Camenca 216  
 Capidava 99, 100, 103, 136, 157–68, 291  
 Cârnațeni, village 210  
 Carpathian Basin 80, 88, 90, 95  
 Carpathian Ruthenia 73  
 Carpathians 111, 126, 249, 323  
 Caspian Sea 194, 261, 321  
 Caucasus 4, 59, 213, 258, 260, 269  
 Celts 296. *See also* Franks  
 Cernavodă 103  
 Chaban (Çopan, Τζοπών), Pecheneg tribe 33  
 Cherson (Chersonesus, Χερσωνος) 222, 224–26, 232–33, 289, 319, 321  
 Cherven 139  
 Chilia, branch of Danube delta 190, 219, 222  
 China (Çin) 52, 207  
 Chișinău 217  
 Chuvashes 317  
 Codru uplands 209  
 Cogâlnic, river 27, 204  
 Constanța 100, 122  
 Constantinople 1, 2, 10, 12, 23, 41, 48, 50, 54, 64, 108, 126–28, 132, 136, 162, 165–67, 174, 180, 220–21, 226, 238–39, 247, 268, 270–71, 276, 288–89, 292–95, 297, 301–2, 305, 307–8, 316, 321, 324. *See also* Istanbul  
 Copenhagen 181, 289  
 Čortanovci 183  
 Crimea (Crimean Peninsula) 25, 54, 62, 64, 95, 190–91, 205, 222–24, 226, 228–34, 254, 269, 283, 299, 301, 315, 323. *See also* Taurica

- Crimean Tatars 252  
 Croatia 66  
 Croats 292  
 Csángó 44  
 Cumania Major (Nagykunság) 32  
 Cumans, Quman 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 11–15, 20,  
 21–23, 27–32, 34, 37–40, 44, 46, 48–52,  
 56, 57, 65, 66, 68, 70, 76–78, 81, 87,  
 89–91, 93–95, 98, 103–4, 106–7, 109,  
 115–16, 120, 123, 126, 128, 130, 132–33,  
 136–37, 148, 150, 156, 162, 165, 167,  
 172, 175–77, 179–80, 182–84, 186–88,  
 190–91, 195, 201–2, 207, 212, 214–16,  
 218, 220, 222–23, 225, 229–30, 233,  
 235–36, 243, 245–47, 249–52, 255–56,  
 263–64, 268, 285, 287, 296, 298, 305,  
 308–12, 315, 317, 319–21, 323–24, 326,  
 328. *See also* Polovtsi, Kipchaks,  
 Kuns  
 Čuprija 183  
 Czecho-Slovakia 56
- Dacians 113  
 Dalmatia 132  
 Danube, Danube region, river 2, 4, 10, 11,  
 24, 26, 36, 41, 45, 46, 48, 51, 53, 59, 80,  
 85, 90, 91, 97, 98, 100, 102, 104–8, 110,  
 113–18, 120–21, 124–25, 127–30, 132–34,  
 136–37, 139, 145, 148–49, 156–57, 159,  
 164–69, 174, 177–79, 190–91, 204, 210,  
 212, 214, 219–20, 222, 232, 236, 242,  
 247–49, 263, 266–70, 272, 274, 285–86,  
 289–91, 297–98, 323–26, 328. *See also*  
 Ister  
 Danube-Black Sea Canal 99, 100, 189  
 Danubian Plain 107, 113, 114  
 Dardanelles (strait) 323  
 Demir Kapija 149  
 Derwent 104, 291  
 Dim, river 204  
 Dinogetia (Gărvan, Tulcea county) 99, 100,  
 102–3, 114, 128, 136, 149, 157–58, 291  
 Dnieper, river 26, 62, 85, 200, 235, 272, 284,  
 289, 299, 301  
 Dniester, river 24, 26, 27, 85, 97, 105, 148–49,  
 174, 191, 204, 207–8, 212, 214–19, 221,  
 247–49  
 Dobrich, city and province 142, 150  
 Dobruja 41, 44, 51, 100, 102–4, 107–9, 111, 114,  
 116, 118, 126–29, 133–34, 140, 147, 153,  
 155–57, 167, 171, 174, 234, 324  
 Northern Dobruja 98, 116  
 Southern Dobruja (Cadrilater) 41, 73  
 Dojbany-2, village 216  
 Dolno Sakhrane 149  
 Don, river 85, 148–49, 200, 203, 205, 230,  
 232, 258, 299, 301, 310, 315  
 Donbas 62  
 Dridu, village 96  
 Dubossary district 216  
 Dumbarton Oaks, historic estate 266, 273,  
 327  
 Durankulak 146  
 Durlești 216  
 Durostorum (Dorostolon, Drüstür, Drastar,  
 Dristra) 47, 116, 126, 142, 144, 149,  
 151–52, 155–57, 159, 179, 285, 291. *See*  
*also* Silistra
- East (Orient) 6, 24, 69, 94, 95, 100, 168, 252,  
 296, 311  
 Eastern Roman Empire 271, 307. *See also*  
 Byzantine Empire  
 Eastern Slavs 60, 74, 208, 212, 249  
 Ekaterinoslav, province 27  
 Enisala (Heracleea) 100  
 Etulia 216  
 EU (European Union) 95, 326  
 Euchaita 173  
 Eurasia 193, 198, 200, 207, 229, 254, 262, 312,  
 317, 319  
 Europe 1, 12, 15, 19, 39, 45, 53, 55, 58, 60, 62,  
 69, 71, 78, 80, 84, 85, 131, 140, 187–88,  
 190, 250, 256, 264–65, 304, 313, 323,  
 326–27  
 Central 1, 5, 28, 73, 80, 83, 239, 323–24,  
 327  
 Eastern 1, 5, 12, 14, 15, 18, 20, 21, 25, 28, 31,  
 34, 41, 56, 57, 64, 65, 80, 82, 83, 95, 114,  
 138, 188, 190, 192, 196, 198–99, 206, 266,  
 268, 283–84, 288, 311, 318–19, 323–24,  
 327–28  
 Northern 321  
 Southeastern 1, 4–6, 20, 28, 34, 73, 135,  
 159, 239, 244, 323, 327–28  
 Western 12, 14, 18, 92

- Fejér, county 91  
 Fertő, lake 91  
 Finno-Ugric peoples 31, 311  
 First Bulgarian Empire 36, 41, 46, 113, 120,  
 139–40, 166–67, 170, 212, 268. *See also*  
 Bulgaria  
 Fische, river 311  
 Flemish people 38  
 Florida 134  
 France 6  
 Franks 38, 181  
  
 Gagauzes 44, 48, 49, 52, 137, 252, 262–63  
 Gajal, ethnic minority 137  
 Galați 121  
 Gamzigrad 183  
 Ganos (Γάνος) 233  
 Garvan, village in Silistra province 142,  
 146  
 Genoese people 223  
 Georgians 243  
 Getae 113  
 Ghiolul Pietrei, archaeological site near  
 cognominal lake 127  
 Giessen 311–12  
 Gigen 142, 144, 158  
 Golden Horde 114, 198–200, 262  
 Golu (Banului), island 103  
 Goths 54, 223  
 Great Bulgaria 262  
 Great Morava Valley 185  
 Greece 41, 180, 183, 265  
 Greeks 84, 98, 140, 243  
  
 Haemus (Haemus Mons, Balkan  
 Mountains) 166, 178, 290–91  
 Halle 297  
 Hamburg 40  
 Hansca 149, 212–13, 216, 218  
 Hârșova 128, 157  
 Haskovo 142  
 Hebrus (Maritsa), river 12, 14, 18  
 Herzegovina 184, 187  
 Hisarlaka 142  
 Hlinaia 216  
 Holy Land 185  
 Holy Roman Empire 185  
 Hundred Hills, historical region 134  
  
 Hungarians, Hungarian tribes 2, 31, 35, 49,  
 69, 77, 80, 81, 83–85, 87, 90, 92–94,  
 104, 131, 149, 173, 187, 189, 288–89, 291,  
 295, 299, 321, 326. *See also* Magyars;  
 Ούγγροι; Τούρκοι  
 Hungary, Hungarian state 5, 20, 22, 30, 33,  
 36, 44, 56, 57, 64, 66, 71, 73–76, 79–81,  
 83–85, 87–89, 91–95, 104, 149, 172–73,  
 178, 182, 185, 235, 265, 288–90, 311–12,  
 319, 323, 326  
 Huns 33, 70, 173, 317  
 Hutsuls 44  
  
 Ialomița, county 121  
 Ialomița, river 85, 111  
 Ialoveni district 218  
 Iași 118  
 Iasians 93, 319. *See also* Alans; Jászok  
 Ilek, river 204  
 Ioannina 181  
 Iran 40, 58  
 Irkutsk 69  
 Irpin', river 26  
 Isaccea 100, 128, 130, 149  
 Iskra (Kargalar) 142, 144  
 Ismailites 296  
 Istanbul 15, 188  
 Ister, river 284. *See also* Danube  
 Italy 285  
 Izmail 210  
 İzmir 187  
  
 Jászok, Jász people 1, 31, 91, 93. *See also*  
 Alans; Iasians  
 Jerusalem 270  
 Jiu, river 85  
  
 Kabars (Kavars) 131, 311  
 Kadarans 25  
 Kakhovka Reservoir 226  
 Kalavrye 306  
 Kaleto Hill (in Odürtsi village) 147  
 Kaliakra 144, 146, 156  
 Kalipetrovo, village 126  
 Kalka, river (today supposedly Kalchik) 249  
 Kanagyol (Canora), river 156  
 Kangar(s) (Xangār, Kangarāyē), tribe 77, 318  
 Karcag 32, 35

- Karcag–Ködszállás, puszta (steppe) 35  
 Karluks 318  
 Kavarna 146  
 Kazakhs 252, 260, 263  
 Kazakhstan 257, 260  
 Kazan 262  
 Kék-kends 311  
 Kerch, city 226  
 Kerch Peninsula 226  
 Kerch Strait 234  
 Khalizs 311  
 Kharkiv 261  
 Khazar Khaganate, Khazaria 1, 4, 193, 232, 269, 288, 299, 315–16, 319, 321  
 Khazars 28, 70, 77, 81, 131, 173, 181–82, 190, 192–94, 223, 231–32, 298–99, 301, 304, 311–15, 320  
 Khitovo 146  
 Khorasan 256  
 Khwarezm 256, 315, 321  
 Kiliya 156  
 Kimaks 263, 318  
 Kimek, tribe 201  
 Kipchaks, Қыпчақ 22, 43, 78, 254, 256, 262–63, 311. *See also* Cumans  
 Kladentsi 146  
 Koule 179  
 Kovačica 183  
 Kovin 183  
 Κουλιγγοί 63  
 Krasnoyarsk 69  
 Krivina 144, 148  
 Kuban region 232  
 Kulikovo Field 249  
 Kuns, Qun 31, 311. *See also* Cumans  
 Kyiv (Kiev) 21, 59, 100, 173, 238, 247, 262, 316  
 Kyrgyz 260, 263  
  
 Lacul Tei 121  
 Latins (Western Christians) 11  
 Lebounion (Levounion) 133, 178, 306  
 Leipzig 70  
 Leitha, river 311  
 Leningrad 208. *See also* St. Petersburg  
 Levédia (Levedia, Λεβεδία) 30, 77, 299  
 Likostomo (Chilia) 124  
 Limbari-Căprăria, archaeological site 149, 218  
 Little Russia, Governorate 283  
  
 Logănești 212–13  
 London 65, 265  
 Lovech 127, 149  
  
 Macedonia 83, 157  
 Măcin 52, 128  
 Magyars, Magyarok 1, 28–30, 32, 34, 64, 65, 70, 83, 84, 98, 141, 167, 173, 174, 181, 192, 231, 250, 292–93, 299, 302. *See also* Hungarians; Τούρκοι  
 Maksimovka 197  
 Maly Uzen, river 204  
 Mangup 232  
 Manzikert 304  
 Mărculești-Viișoara 103  
 Mashhad 40  
 Matichane 149  
 Mediterranean Sea, Mediterranean region 15, 168, 269  
 Mednikarovo 148  
 Melnik 139  
 Μεσοποταμία τῆς Δύσεως (Mesopotamia of the West) 272  
 Mezőföld, region 92  
 Middle East 244  
 Mircea Vodă, village 98  
 Μιξοβάρβαροι (Mixobarbarians), terminus technicus of Byzantine sources 113, 175, 177, 286, 294  
 Moesia 157, 284  
 Moldavia (Moldova), region 37, 97, 105, 107–8, 111, 114, 118–19, 121, 209, 212, 254  
 Moldova, Republic of, RM, modern state 39, 89, 105, 149, 194, 200, 207–8, 210, 213, 215–17, 235, 248–49. *See also* Moldova, Republic of  
 Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic, MSSR (Moldavian SSR, Moldavian Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic) 207, 211, 248  
 Molești 212–13, 216  
 “Mongol-Tatars”, Mongols 19, 78, 81, 85, 249–50, 263, 328  
 Moravia 292  
 Moscow 15, 208, 262, 283–84  
 MQDWN, people or state from the Schechter Letter 319  
 Munich 69, 266  
 Muntenia 97, 108–9, 127

- Murfatlar (Basarabi) 100, 101, 103, 140-41,  
143, 313
- Muscovy 55, 255
- Nagyszentmiklós 33, 187, 253. *See also*  
Sânnicolau Mare
- Nava Cherna 146
- Niculitel 100
- Nikopol 139
- Nish 127, 149, 157
- North 296
- North Crimean Canal 222, 226-27
- North Macedonia, present day state 88,  
149, 180
- Nova Cherna 142
- Novi Pazar, sanjak 1
- Noviodunum (Isaccea) 100, 126-27, 291
- Novosibirsk 262
- Nozharevo 142, 146
- Nufăru 126-28, 157, 291
- Nyéks 311
- Odessa region 211
- Odürtsi 142, 144, 146-49, 204, 234
- Oghuzes (Oghuz tribes, Oguzs, Ghuzzes,  
Oghuz Turks) 39, 40, 58, 79, 81, 93,  
94, 180, 186, 190, 193, 195, 198, 201-5,  
255-56, 262, 314-16, 318-19. *See also*  
Uzes; Torks
- Oghuz state 317
- Ohrid 112, 266-68, 272
- Okorsh 142
- Old Great Bulgaria 262
- Olsava, river 311
- Olt, river 85
- Oltenia 97, 108, 127
- Opacii, village 210
- Oreanda-Isar 232
- Orel, river 204
- Ottoman Turks 84, 315
- Ottoman Empire, Ottoman Porte 176, 265,  
292. *See also* Sublime Porte
- Ovče Pole 127
- Oxford 18, 102, 124, 136, 140, 239, 266-67,  
276, 299, 324
- Păcuiful lui Soare 100, 104, 116, 128, 136,  
156-57, 272
- Pamphylon 153
- Pančevo 183
- Panea (Ai-Panda, Simeiz) 232
- Pannonia 1, 30, 250
- Pannonian Basin 92
- Paris 65, 69, 265, 283-84, 298, 327
- Paristrion (Παρίστριον, Paradunavon),  
theme 4, 37, 42, 47, 48, 107, 113,  
126-29, 132, 154, 171, 174-75, 177, 179,  
267, 292, 294
- Partenit 232-33
- Partium 36
- Patzinaks (Πατζινάκοι) 1, 134, 307. *See also*  
Pechenegs
- Patzinakia (Patzinacia, Πατζινάκιά) 2, 126,  
132-33, 152, 204, 222
- Peçene 40
- Peceneaga, village 107
- Peçenek 40
- Pecheneg khaganate 315
- Pechenegs, Pečenegs, Pecheneg tribes 1, 2,  
5-23, 25, 28-35, 37-40, 44, 46, 48-50,  
52, 56-60, 62-64, 66, 68, 70, 71, 76-78,  
80, 81, 83-85, 87, 89-95, 97, 98, 101, 102,  
104-8, 112-16, 121, 123, 126-37, 140-42,  
144-49, 151-59, 162, 165, 167, 170-88,  
190-91, 193, 195-98, 200-5, 207, 209,  
212-16, 218, 221-23, 225-27, 229-40,  
242-43, 245-47, 249-53, 255-56, 264,  
268-69, 272-73, 277-78, 284-321,  
323-24, 326-28. *See also* Bacanâk; al-  
Beğenâk; Besenyó(k); Patzinaks
- Peloponnesos 180
- Pernik 139
- Pezinavöllu 38
- Philippopolis (Plovdiv) 66, 148
- Pliska 24, 139, 142, 144, 147, 149, 157-58, 313
- Poland 95, 303-5, 313, 326
- Polovtsi (Polovtsy) 9, 20, 22, 57, 190, 196,  
198, 323. *See also* Cumans
- Pomoravlje district 183
- Popina 142, 146
- Poróssya (river Ros' region) 318
- Požarevac 183
- Prague 53, 59, 110
- Preslav 139, 144, 148-49, 154-55, 165, 274, 291
- Presthlavitsa 291
- Professor Ishirkovo, village 159
- Proto-Bulgarians 94, 139, 142-44, 168, 187,  
317. *See also* Bulgars

- Prut, river 85, 190–91, 207–8, 210, 212,  
214–16, 218–19
- ΡΥΡΥΝΥΛ, people from the Schechter  
Letter 319
- Qaçı, river 27
- Qanglı 78
- Qıpçaq, mount 254
- Ravno (Ćuprija) 183
- Rhomaioi, Romei 65, 270. *See also* Romans;  
Byzantines
- Roman Empire 132, 164, 265
- Romania, Romanian People's Republic 5,  
20, 36, 71, 73–75, 80, 88, 89, 96, 103–5,  
108, 110–11, 122–25, 135–36, 138, 149, 155,  
160, 235, 265, 323–24, 326
- Romanians, Romanian people, Romanian  
population 7, 38, 42, 43, 45, 74,  
98, 102–3, 110–15, 120, 135–36, 189,  
326
- Romans 293, 296. *See also* Rhomaioi;  
Byzantines
- Rome 69, 223, 270–71, 308
- Ros', river 26, 318
- Rus' (Ῥωστια, Rhosia) 1, 4, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15,  
19, 44, 49, 56, 57, 59, 60, 65, 74, 95, 100,  
120, 173, 179–82, 223–25, 230, 237–40,  
242–43, 246–47, 249–50, 255–56, 261,  
264, 284, 288–90, 298–99, 301–2, 312,  
315–16, 319–21, 325–26
- Drevlianian' 59
- Kyivan 4, 208, 255
- Polianian' 59
- Rusenovo 146
- Russia (Muscovy, Russian Empire) 15, 16,  
20, 21, 24, 55, 58, 62, 66, 71, 74, 208, 236,  
254–55, 258, 283, 323, 326
- Russia, Russian Federation, present day  
state 192, 235, 247
- Russian people 190
- Ruyno 142
- Săiți, village 210
- Saloniki 157. *See also* Thessaloniki
- Samanid state 315
- Samara, city and region 204
- Samara, river 204
- Sânnicolau Mare 33, 187, 253. *See also*  
Nagyszentmiklós
- Saqsin 312. *See also* Atel
- Sarajevo 1
- Sărata, river 27
- Saratov, city and region 204
- Saraylı Qiyat 228
- Sarkel 62, 149, 192–93, 298–99
- Sárvíz, river 35, 91, 92
- Sasanid state 315
- Sava, river 183
- Scythians (Σκυθαι) 51, 64, 66, 134, 227, 244,  
251, 287, 293, 295–96
- Second Bulgarian Empire 2, 41, 44, 51, 137,  
139, 166, 292. *See also* Bulgaria
- Seljuks (Seljuk Turks) 2, 10, 11, 19, 54, 70, 84,  
158, 180, 196, 296, 309, 315
- Serbia 66, 88, 149, 155, 180, 183–84, 265
- Serbs 7, 43, 292
- Serdica 127
- Seret, river 204
- Shabo 216
- Shumen 151
- Siberia 94, 260
- Silistra 42, 50, 126. *See also* Durostorum
- Silistra, province 142
- Simferopol 27, 227
- Siret, river 85, 299
- Siverskiy Donets, river 27, 85, 204, 231
- Skala 142, 144, 156, 157
- Slavs, Slavic people, Slavic population 10,  
14, 31, 37, 48, 74, 95, 97, 104, 112, 135, 137,  
139, 149, 189–90, 208, 209, 211, 220, 224,  
226, 249, 252, 255, 292, 312
- Sliven (Khisarlúka) 144, 146
- Slobozia 121, 216
- Slovakia 176
- Sofia 157, 302
- Sogdians 320
- Sougdaia (Sugdea, Sugdaea, Σουγδαία) 25,  
232–33. *See also* Sudak
- Southern Buh, river 85, 204, 299
- Southern Slavs 182, 212
- Soviet Union 5, 73, 235, 257–58. *See also*  
USSR
- Spanțov 128
- Sremska Mitrovica 183
- St. Petersburg 265. *See also* Leningrad

- Stari Kostolac, village 183  
 Staro Selo 142  
 Staroselets 149  
 Struma, river 157  
 Stürmen 144  
 Sublime Porte 265. *See also* Ottoman Empire  
 Sudak 25, 233–34. *See also* Sougdaia  
 Südievo 142  
 Sukha Reka, river 156  
 Surguch, ethnic minority 48, 137  
 Syr Darya, river 314  
 Syria 40  
 Syvash, lake 226–28  
 Szeged 80, 81  
 Szeklers 311
- Ταλμάτζιοι, Pecheneg tribe 63, 64  
 Taman hillfort 234  
 Taman Peninsula 5, 223, 230  
 Tarhanqut Peninsula 254  
 Tatars 37, 78, 190, 305  
 Tauri, Scythian tribe 231  
 Taurica 224, 230–31. *See also* Crimea  
 Tatarbunary 209  
 Teleorman, county 122  
 Teleorman, river 111  
 Terebovlia 14  
 Thessaloniki, Thessalonica 182. *See also* Saloniki  
 Thessaly 290  
 Thrace 157, 182, 290  
 Tiraspol 210  
 Tisza, river 222  
 Tivertsi, tribe 208  
 Tmutarakan (Tamatarcha) 15, 179, 232, 234, 301  
 Todireni 119  
 Tolna, county 91  
 Tomaševac 183  
 Topola 142, 146  
 Torks, Torke, Torks-Uzes 1, 9, 21, 22, 26, 27, 31, 56, 70, 79, 190, 193, 195–97, 204, 207, 213–15, 221, 249, 314–15, 319, 323. *See also* Oghuzes
- Τούρκοι 244. *See also* Magyars  
 Toqsaba, clan name 255  
 Transcaucasia 229  
 Transoxiana (Mā Warā' an-Nahr) 256, 314
- Transylvania 36, 73, 79, 89, 112, 118, 130–31, 326  
 Trnjane, archaeological site 183  
 Troesmis 128  
 Tropaeum Traiani, monument 104  
 Tsar Asen 142, 144, 146, 156, 157  
 Tsimlyansky Reservoir 192  
 Tsimlyansky settlement 62, 192, 193  
 Tulcea 125, 128  
 Turkey 39, 40, 180, 217  
 Turkmens 252  
 Turks (Turkic tribes, Turkic peoples) 10, 38, 39, 50–52, 55, 58, 59, 69, 70, 78, 80, 83, 84, 137, 165, 176–77, 180–82, 186–87, 239, 251, 261, 263, 267, 313–15, 317  
 Tutrakan 144, 156  
 ΤΩΡΩΥ', people from the Schechter Letter 319  
 Tyumen 250
- Ugra, river 249  
 Ugria 56. *See* Hungary  
 Ukraine 20, 39, 71, 89, 200, 204, 211, 213, 223, 231, 233, 235, 323  
 Ukrainian SSR (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) 229  
 Ukrainian people 217  
 Urals (Ural Mountains) 26, 27, 62, 85, 201, 204, 310, 315, 318  
 USSR (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) 62, 73, 88, 104, 190–91, 208, 219, 222, 236, 252, 255–56, 257–58, 260, 262–63, 324–26. *See also* Soviet Union  
 Uzbeks 25, 252, 263  
 Uzes, Οὔζιοι, Uzes-Torks 1, 2, 5, 6, 9–12, 20–22, 25, 30, 34, 37, 39, 40, 44, 45, 49–52, 57, 58, 70, 83, 95, 108, 113, 128–30, 132, 137, 156, 158, 165, 167, 176–77, 180, 182, 185, 187–88, 196, 201–2, 215–16, 218, 229–30, 233–36, 250–52, 263–64, 268, 287, 289, 291, 298, 307, 309–12, 315, 319, 326, 328. *See also* Torks; Oghuzes
- Valandar (W.l.n.d.r) 65, 300  
 Varangians 38, 59, 119  
 Vardar, river 149  
 Varna 150, 155  
 Vatican City 277

- Vedeia, river 85  
 Veliko Tarnovo 139, 169  
 Venetians 309  
 Vetren 142, 144, 152-53, 156, 158  
 Via Militaris 185  
 Vienna 94, 113, 327  
 Vicina 42  
 Vidin 157  
 Vlachs (Βλάχοι, Vlach population) 36-38,  
     41, 51, 113, 116, 162, 165, 177, 239, 244,  
     249, 326  
 Vojvodina, province 183  
 Volga, river 30, 58, 148, 191, 201, 203-4,  
     235-36, 256, 258, 260, 263, 310, 314, 318  
 Volga Bulgaria 312, 318  
 Vorskla, river 204  
 Wallachia 37, 38, 105, 107-8, 111, 114, 118  
 West 6, 10-12, 17, 24, 54, 58, 292, 296, 307-9,  
     315, 317  
 West (Byzantine) 245, 324  
 Wittenberg 297  
 Yugoslavia 41, 89, 104, 183, 235  
 Zaječar 183  
 Zeta 132  
 Zir Becenek 40



# Index of Persons

- Abu, Attila's son 33  
Abu Sa'īd, Arab historian 315  
Achtum, chieftain 131  
Adrianos Komnenos, younger brother of the Byzantine emperor Alexios I Komnenos 128  
Alakaseis, Byzantine noble family 243  
Albert of Aachen, chronicler 1, 183, 309  
Alexios I Komnenos (Alexius), Byzantine emperor 2, 10, 11, 14, 18, 68, 113, 115–16, 124, 128, 133, 159, 179, 182, 284–85, 291, 295, 306–8  
Ammianus Marcellinus, Roman historian 297  
Anna Komnene, Byzantine princess and writer 10, 50, 63, 66, 113, 128, 162, 243, 277, 285, 297, 305  
Argyros Karatzas, northern barbarian in the service of Alexios I 66, 153, 295  
Asen I, tsar of Bulgaria 110, 137  
Assenids, dynasty 2  
Attila, ruler of the Huns 33  
'Awfī, Persian historian 32  
Βαλτζάρ, son of Kegen 273  
Basil II Porphyrogenitus, Byzantine emperor 10, 47, 50, 68, 275, 289–92  
Bogas/Βογάζ, Ioannes, Byzantine strategos of Cherson 170  
Boniak, Cuman chieftain 11, 14, 246  
Boris Volodimirovich, prince of Rostov 59  
Boutelinos, Frankish warlord 293  
Bruno of Querfurt, Saint (Christian missionary bishop and martyr) 246, 302, 304, 318  
Caragea, Καρατζάδες, Phanariot family 66  
Catherine II, empress regnant of All Russia 7, 15  
Ceașescu, Nicolae 120  
Charlemagne, king of the Franks 319  
Chelgu, Pecheneg chieftain 132–33, 153, 178, 179  
Constantin Humpertus, Byzantine military commander 285  
Constantine IX Monomachos (Qunṣtanṣīn), Byzantine emperor 25, 148, 177, 187  
Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, Byzantine emperor and writer 23, 34, 53, 66, 78, 83–85, 177, 181, 233, 247, 284, 288, 293, 295, 297, 302  
Cyril Phileotes, Saint 161, 277  
Dimitr, unknown župan from Cyrillic inscription 98, 140  
Ephraim, Byzantine historian 279  
Gardīzī, Persian historian 32  
Ġarnāṭī, al- (Arab Muslim traveler) 312  
Gavril Lesnovski (Gabriel of Lesnovo), Saint 49  
Gelou, chieftain 110  
George of Amastris, Saint 17  
Georges Palaeologus, Byzantine military commander 285  
Georges Pyrrhos, Byzantine military commander 285  
Georgios Hamartolos, Byzantine historian 280  
Georgios Kedrenos Byzantine historian 71  
Georgios Pachymeres, Byzantine historian and philosopher 279  
Géza I, Grand Prince of Hungary 185  
Glad, chieftain 110, 130  
Γουλίνος, son of Kegen 273, 286  
Gregorios Pakourianos, Byzantine politician and military commander 245, 279, 306  
Haakon Herdebrei, King of Norway 38  
Harald Hardrada, military commander 306  
Herbert, Aubrey (British diplomat and traveler) 1  
Herodotus, ancient Greek historian 109  
Hierosthlabos, Rus' military commander 286  
Ibn Fadlan, Arab Muslim traveler 40, 186, 203  
Ibn Hayyan, Arab historian 186

- Ibn Rustah Isfahani, Ahmad (Persian geographer) 25
- Ibn Yaqub, Ibrahim (Sephardi Jewish traveler) 50
- Idrīsī, al- (Arab Muslim geographer) 163, 312
- Igor' I, Varangian ruler of Rus 237–38, 300–1
- Ioannes Kinnamos, Byzantine historian 244, 279
- Ioannes Mauropous, Byzantine poet 242, 279, 285, 293, 296–97
- Ioannes Skylitzes, Byzantine historian 24, 71, 243, 250–51, 278, 286, 293, 296–98, 304
- Ioannes Tzetzes, Byzantine poet 278
- Ioannes I Tzimiskes, Byzantine emperor 47, 128, 292, 302
- Ioannes Zonaras, Byzantine historian 70, 277, 280
- Istachri, al- (Persian geographer) 32
- Ivan IV, Grand Prince of Moscow 15
- Jayhānī, al- (geographer at the court of the Samanids) 311
- Johannes de Thurocz, chronicler 172
- John of Plano Carpini, Italian diplomat, archbishop and explorer 85
- Joseph, Bible transcriber from Sougdaia 25
- Joseph II, Kaiser of Austria 15
- Justinian I, Eastern Roman emperor 163, 269
- Kantzous, northern barbarian in the service of Alexios I 295
- Katakalon Kekaumenos, Byzantine statesman and writer 9, 46, 108, 240, 273, 277, 286
- Katranes, northern barbarian in the service of Alexios I 295
- Kegen, Ioannes, Pecheneg chieftain 9, 84, 151–52, 158, 175, 180, 242, 273, 282, 285–86, 297, 305, 325
- Kirialax, Byzantine Emperor from *Hákonar saga Herðibreifs* 38
- Komnenos, Komnenoi dynasty 68, 327
- Köten, Cuman chieftain 30
- Κουλίνας, a Pecheneg 272, 286
- Krakra, Bulgarian voevoda 171
- Kutesk, nomad chieftain 172
- Laonikos Chalkokondyles, Byzantine historian 40
- Lekas, rebel 294
- Leo the Deacon, Byzantine historian 240, 250, 280, 283, 293, 297
- Leo Nikeritas, strategos of Paristrion 127
- “Leo” Pseudo-Diogenes, pretender to the Byzantine throne 9, 12, 38, 116, 305
- Leo Tornikios, Byzantine noble 243, 286, 306
- Leo VI Sophos, Byzantine emperor 299, 300
- L.n.k.v.ā / T.š.k.v.ā, son of L.t.k.ā 187
- L.t.k.ā, Pecheneg king 187
- Macedonian dynasty 181
- Manuel Straboromanos, Byzantine writer 284
- Maria Theresa, Empress of Austria 1
- Mas'udi, al- (Arab historian) 65
- Menumorout, ruler of the lands between the rivers Mureş, Someş and Tisza 110
- Michael Attaleiates, Byzantine historian 113, 278, 280, 286, 293, 296–97
- Michael VII Doukas, Byzantine emperor 10, 14, 17, 18, 306
- Michael Glykas, Byzantine historian 280
- Michael Psellos, Byzantine author 65, 243, 279, 293, 297, 305
- Mstislav, Rus' prince 15
- Napoleon I, French emperor 284
- Neantzes, northern barbarian in the service of Alexios I 295
- Nesisthlabos, Rus' military commander 286
- Nestor, Byzantine vestarches 132, 294
- Nicholas I Mystikos, patriarch of Constantinople 276, 293
- Nikephoros III Botaneiates, Byzantine emperor 243
- Nikephoros Bryennios, Byzantine statesman and historian 278, 279, 305–6
- Nikephoros II Phokas, Byzantine emperor 302
- Niketas Choniates, Byzantine historian 244, 278
- Niketas Kastamonites, Byzantine military commander 285

- Olaf II Haraldsson, Saint and king of Norway 119
- Olga of Kyiv, regent of Kyivan Rus' 302
- Otto I, emperor of Holy Roman Empire 319
- Pesakh, Khazar chieftain 233
- Peter I, tsar of Bulgaria 137, 167
- Peter Tudebode, French historian 1, 309
- Potëmkin, Grigoriĭ, Russian statesman 7
- Priscus of Panium, Byzantine historian 297
- Regino of Prüm, abbot of Prüm, chronicler 85
- Robert, count of Flanders 11, 18
- Robert the Monk, chronicler 309
- Romanos I Lekapenos, Byzantine emperor 288
- Romanos III Argyros, Byzantine emperor 233
- Romanos IV Diogenes, Byzantine emperor 233, 296
- Rumiantsev, Nikolai, Russian statesman 283
- Rumiantsev-Zadunayskii, Piotr, Russian statesman 283
- Salomon, king of Hungary 133, 172, 178–79
- Samuel, tsar of Bulgaria 47
- Satzas (Σατζᾶς), local chieftain 42, 110, 132, 326
- Seslav (Σεσθλάβος), local chieftain 42, 110, 132, 326
- Sfengus (Sphengos), brother of Volodimir I 60
- Shishmanids, dynasty 137
- Simeon I, emperor of Bulgaria 47, 137, 141, 167, 170, 173–74, 289, 306
- Snorri Sturluson, Icelandic historian 38
- Stalin, Joseph, ruler of USSR 18, 190
- Stefan Vojislav, prince of Duklja 132
- Stephen, Saint 290
- Stephen of Surozh, Saint 17
- Sviatopolk I Volodimirovich, Grand Prince of Kyiv 59
- Sviatoslav I, Grand Prince of Kyiv 60, 64, 110, 142, 171, 173–74, 230, 237, 250, 300–4
- Sviatoslav II Yaroslavich, Grand Prince of Kyiv 14
- Symeon Logothetes, Symeon the Metaphrast, Byzantine writer 279
- Synadene, niece of Nikephoros Botaneiates 243, 290
- Taksony, Grand Prince of Hungary 87
- Tatikios, Byzantine military commander 285
- Tatous (Τατούς, Χαλής), rebel 42, 43, 110, 132, 175, 326
- Tengri, name for the primary chief deity among early Turks 143
- Terterids, dynasty 137
- Theodoros Prodromos, Byzantine writer 279
- Theodoros Skoutariotes, Byzantine official and writer 280
- Theophilos, archiereus of Euchaita, Byzantine envoy to the Pechenegs 173, 302
- Theophylact of Ohrid, Byzantine archbishop of Ohrid 162, 278, 284
- Thonuzoba, Pecheneg khan 87
- Traulos, rebel 294
- Tugorkhan, Cuman chieftain 11, 14, 246
- Τουτᾶχ/Toutach, the same as Τυράχ/Tyrach 000
- Τυράχ/Tyrach, Ioannes, Pecheneg chieftain 84, 127, 149, 153–54, 158, 175, 242, 282, 285, 293, 297, 325
- Varró, István, last known speaker of the Cuman language in Hungary 1
- Vasilko Rostislavovich, Prince of Terebovlia 12, 14, 17, 18
- Volodimir I, Grand Prince of Rus' 15, 59, 60, 230, 289, 290
- Vsevolod Yaroslavovich, Grand Prince of Kyiv 17, 18
- William of Rubruck, Flemish Franciscan missionary and explorer 85
- Yaropolk I Sviatoslavich, Grand Prince of Kyiv 59
- Yaroslav I, Grand Prince of Kyiv 59, 108, 319
- Zinisthlabos, Russian military commander 286

# Index of Modern Authors

- Abdumanapov, Rustam 262  
Adji, Murad 263  
Aerts, Willem 279  
Agadzhanov, Sergej 256  
Ahrweiler (Glykatzi-Ahrweiler),  
    Hélène 134, 168, 268, 270–71, 292, 324  
Akhinzhanov, Serzhan 256  
Aladzhov, Zhivko 142  
Alexopoulos, Theocharis 182  
Anastasiu, Florian 121  
Anchabadze, Zurab 256  
Angeli, Fëdor 261  
Angelov, Dimitür 140, 165–66  
Angelova, Stefka 146  
Angold, Michael 275, 306  
Anokhin, Vladilen 229  
Antonin (Kapustin), archimandrite 25  
Antonović, Miloš 185  
Appelbaum, David 73  
Aristov, Nikolai 9, 21  
Armarchuk, Kateryna 206  
Artamonov, Mikhail 62, 192–94, 234  
Arutyunova-Fidayan, Viada 245  
Atanasov, Georgi 129, 152, 155–57, 174, 325  
Atavin, Andrei 201  
Auezova, Zifa-Alua 259  
Aybabin, Olexandr 227, 229  
Ayönü, Yusuf 187, 306
- Bagaliï, Dmytro 21  
Bagi, Gábor 87  
Baïchorov, Soslanbek 253  
Bálint, Csanád 35, 82, 91, 94, 95  
Balogh, László 87, 305  
Bănescu, Nicolae 4, 43, 45–47, 50, 102, 110  
Bang, Willi 32  
Bantysh-Kamens'kyï, Dmytro 21  
Baranov, Igor' 230  
Baraschi, Silvia 117  
Barnea, Ion 98, 100, 101–2, 105, 135–36, 140,  
    253, 324  
Bartha, Antal 75, 82  
Bartold, Vasiliï 25, 29, 58  
Bartucz, Lajos 35  
Bartusis, Mark 306  
Baskakov, Nikolai 254
- Baumann, Victor Henrich 125  
Beck, Hans-Georg 277  
Beilis, Wolf 259  
Bejan, Adrian 121  
Bekker, August Immanuel 66  
Beliaev, Ivan 21  
Belitzky, János 34  
Belke, Klaus 277  
Benac, Alojz 184, 187  
Benešević, Vladimir 272  
Berend, Nora 87, 88  
Bertényi, Iván 75  
Beshevliev, Veselin 141, 143  
Bestuzhev-Ryumin, Konstantin 17  
Bibikov, Mikhail 4, 19, 241, 244, 326  
Boba, Imre 83  
Bobcheva, Lyubka 142  
Boev, Petür 143  
Bogrea, Vasile 43  
Bollók, János 87  
Bolşacov-Ghimpu, Alexandru 100  
Bolshakov, Oleg 258  
Boltin, Ivan 21  
Bonarek, Jacek 304  
Boncz, Ödön 34  
Bondar, Rima 219  
Boswell, Bruce 43, 65  
Bozhilov, Ivan 117, 140, 161, 170–71, 173–74  
Brand, Charles M. 279  
Brandenburg, Nikolai 26  
Brătescu, Constantin 44  
Brătianu, Gheorge Ioan 44  
Braudel, Fernand 269  
Brockelmann, Karl 34  
Brudiu, Mihalache 121  
Brutskus, Yuriï 56  
Bubenok, Oleg 257  
Buckler, Georgina 277  
Bulatovich, Svitlana 219  
Burachkov, Platon 9, 21  
Bury, John Bagnell 65, 66  
Bushakov, Valeriï 254
- Câmpina, Barbu 110, 111  
Chalandon, Ferdinand 67, 68, 115, 327  
Chantereau Le Febvre, Louis 15

- Charanis, Peter 307  
 Chebotarenko, Georgiï 114, 209, 211–12, 247, 249, 263  
 Cherepanova, Yelena 227, 229  
 Chernet, Jean-Claude 153, 275, 282, 306  
 Chirilă, Eugen 123  
 Chwolson, Daniel 25  
 Ciggaar, Krijnie 306  
 Cihodaru, Constantin 100, 105, 118  
 Codoñer, Juan Signes 279  
 Comşa, Eugen 98, 99  
 Comşa (Chişvasi-Comşa), Maria 97  
 Condurachi, Emil 101, 140  
 Corbu, Emilia 121  
 Cresci, Lia Raffaella 296  
 Curta, Florin 4, 134–35, 296–97  
 Custurea, Gabriel 125  
 Czebe, Gyula 34  
 Czeglédy, Károly 76, 77, 82
- Damian, Oana 117, 125  
 Darkó, Eugen 34  
 Dawes, Elizabeth 65  
 Degtyarëv, Alexandr 249  
 Densuşianu, Nicolae 43  
 Diaconu, Petre 3, 98, 101, 103–9, 111, 114–18, 123, 126, 129, 136, 140, 145, 157, 170–71, 249, 274, 285, 324–25  
 Dieter, Karl 63  
 Dieterich, Karl 65  
 Dimitrov, Khristo 172–74  
 Diyarbekirli, Nejat 187  
 Dobrodomov, Igor' 254  
 Dobrolyubskii, Andriï 199, 204, 211, 213–14, 249, 263  
 Dobrovský, Josef 284  
 Doimi de Frankopan, Peter 124, 306, 308–9  
 Dölger, Franz 66, 181  
 Dombrovskii, Oleg 231  
 Doncheva-Petkova, Lyudmila 145–49  
 Dorofeyev, Volodymyr 206  
 Dosymbayeva, Ayman 257  
 Drăganu, Nicolae 43  
 Drahomanov, Mykhailo, under the penname P. Kuzmichevskii 22  
 Drinov, Marin 49  
 Dubov, Igor' 249  
 Dubynets, Oleh 206  
 Dudek, Jarosław 304, 325
- Dučhev, Ivan 52, 160, 165  
 Dzhansūzov, Stoyan 39  
 Dzigovskii, Alexandr 213
- Ecsedy, Ildikó 82  
 Engels, Friedrich 236  
 Erdélyi, István 82, 90, 94  
 Ernst, Nikolai 62, 223, 227  
 Erzi, Adnan Sadik 186–87  
 Esin, Emel 187
- Failler, Albert 279  
 Featherstone, Michael 279  
 Fehér, Géza 33, 172  
 Fehér, Mátyás Jenő 83  
 Fejér, György 31  
 Fejić, Nenad 185  
 Ferent, Ioan 44, 45  
 Ferjančić, Božidar 184  
 Ferluga, Jadran 294  
 Fiedler, Uwe 148  
 Florescu, Grigore 99  
 Flusin, Bernard 278  
 Fodor, István 82  
 Franklin, Simon 289  
 Frondzhulo, Mikhail 230, 233  
 Fyodorov, Georgii 194, 208–9  
 Fyodorov-Davydov, German 91, 114–15, 197–200, 213–14, 235, 263, 324
- Gadlo, Alexandr 230  
 Garustovich, Gennadiï 201–2, 204  
 Gautier, Paul 278, 284–85  
 Gavrulina, Larisa 205  
 Gerasimov, Todor 52  
 Geric, József 87  
 Gibbon, Edward 265  
 Gilferding, Alexandr 21  
 Gilis, Odysseas 182  
 Ginsburg, Wulf 193  
 Giuglea, George 43  
 Giurescu, Constantin 105, 110–11  
 Göckenjan, Hansgerd 87, 311–12  
 Golb, Norman 319  
 Golden, Peter Benjamin 4, 298, 314–18  
 Gołębiowska-Tobiasz, Aneta 314  
 Golev, Konstantin 176  
 Golubovskii, Petro 9, 21, 22, 57, 63, 249  
 Gombocz, Zoltán 32, 69, 76  
 Gordlevskii, Vladimir 58

- Gorodtsov, Vasilii 27  
 Grabianka, Grygorii 21  
 Grămadă, Nicolae 44  
 Granovskiĭ, Timofeĭ 14  
 Grégoire, Henri 283  
 Grekov, Boris 13, 14, 17, 60, 223, 247  
 Grierson, Philip 129, 158  
 Grigor'yeu, Vasilii 22  
 Grinchenko, Volodymyr 62  
 Grot, Konstantin 22  
 Grushevoi, Alexandr 54  
 Grushevs'kyi, Mykhaïlo 21  
 Gudkov, Alexandr 210  
 Gumilyov, Lev 56, 194, 198, 249, 261, 263  
 Guseinov, Rauf 256  
 Gyárfás, István 31  
 Gyóni, Mátyás 37–39, 43, 83, 328  
 Györfly, György 34, 82–85, 90  
 Gyuzelev, Vasil 140, 161
- Halasi-Kun, Tibor 314  
 Haldon, John 277  
 Harkavy, Avraam/Albert 25  
 Harmatta, János 78  
 Harŕuche, Nicolae 121  
 Hase, Charles Benoît 283  
 Hatházi, Gábor 92  
 Hendrickx, Benjamin 283  
 Hinterberger, Martin 280  
 Hóman, Bálint 35  
 Hörandner, Wolfram 279  
 Horváth, Ferenc 92  
 Horváth, Péter 31  
 Howard-Johnston, James 299, 300  
 Hunfalvy, Pál 31
- Iliescu, Octavian 124  
 Iliev, Iliya 172  
 Ioniță, Adrian 121  
 Jordanov, Ivan 117, 126, 151–55, 325  
 Iorga, Nicolae 36, 42–45, 105, 110  
 Őotov, Valeri 150  
 Istvánovits, Márton 78  
 Ivanišević, Vujadin 184  
 Ivanov, Rosen 148  
 Ivanov, Rumen 148  
 Ivanov, Sergeĭ 305  
 Ivanov, Vladimir 201–2, 204
- Jenkins, Romilly James Heald 83, 276  
 Jerney, János 30  
 Jireček, Konstantin 48, 49  
 Jurewicz, Oktawiusz 280, 305
- Kacaros, Vasilis 182  
 Kaimakamova, Miliyana 162  
 Kainov, Sergeĭ Yu. 206  
 Kaldellis, Anthony 280  
 Kalić, Jovanka 185  
 Kalinina, Tatyana 258  
 Kambylis, Athanasios 280  
 Kapitánffy, István 84  
 Karamzin, Nikolaĭ 21  
 Karatay, Osman 187  
 Karyshkovskii-Ikar, Petro 219, 237  
 Katona-Kiss, Attila 81  
 Kazhdan, Alexandr 239, 241–43, 275,  
 285–86, 326  
 Keenan, Edward Louis 284  
 Kenderova, Stoyanka 163  
 Khrapunov, Igor' 229  
 Kirilov, Chavdar 325  
 Kirpichnikov, Anatolii 205  
 Kishchenko, Valentyn 206  
 Kliuchevskii, Vasilii 21  
 Klyashpornyi, Sergeĭ 253, 257  
 Kmoskó, Mihály 31, 311  
 Knauer, Fëdor 27  
 Kniezsa, István 34  
 Knyazkiĭ, Igor' 3, 247–50  
 Kogonashvili, Konstantin 226  
 Kolarov, Khristo 175  
 Komar, Olesiĭ 206  
 Kononov, Andreĭ 254  
 Konovalova, Irina 19, 258  
 Korolyuk, Vladimir 212, 247  
 Kőrösi Csoma, Sándor 32, 82  
 Kossányi, Béla 34  
 Kostomarov, Mykola 21  
 Kovács, Attila 81, 86  
 Kovács, Szilvia 80, 86  
 Kovalivs'kyi, Andriĭ 258  
 Kozlov, Sergeĭ 248, 250–51  
 Krachkovskii, Ignatii 258  
 Krallis, Dimitris 280  
 Kralovánszky, Alán 91  
 Kramarovskii, Mark 206

- Krieger, Vladimir 201–2  
 Kristó, Gyula 87  
 Kropotkin, Vladislav 219  
 Krsmanović, Bojana 184  
 Kruglov, Yevgeniĭ 202–3  
 Krumbacher, Karl 45  
 Krumova, Teodora 150, 174–75  
 Krūstev, Lučezar 176  
 Kryms'kyĭ, Ahatanhel 58  
 Kryukov, Victor 259  
 Kudryashov, Konstantin 191–92  
 Kuhn, Thomas 6, 19, 138  
 Kukhareva, Lyudmila 196, 197  
 Kulakovskii, Yulian 17, 27, 223, 227  
 Kunick, Ernst-Eduard/Arist 21, 25, 26  
 Kurat, Akdes Nimet 40, 186  
 Kurtz, Eduard 64  
 Kutorga, Mikhail 8  
 Kuun, Géza 29, 31  
 Kuzembaev, Nursen 257  
 Kuzmichevskii, P. *See* Mykhailo Drahomanov  
 Kyriazopoulos, Christos 182  
 Kyzlasov, Igor' 253
- Langó, Péter 90  
 Lapsides, Odysseus 279  
 Laurent, Vitalien 66, 279  
 Law, John 73  
 Leahu, Valeriu 121  
 Leciejewicz, Lech 304  
 Léderer, Emma 75  
 Lefort, Jacques 286  
 Leib, Bernard 65, 280, 284  
 Lemerle, Paul 275, 277  
 Leone, Pietro Luigi 278, 280  
 Levchenko, Mitrofan 17, 18, 237–38, 264, 326  
 Lewicki, Tadeusz 312–13  
 Liaskorons'kyĭ, Vasyl' 22  
 Ligeti, Lajos 76, 79  
 Litavrin, Gennadiĭ 18, 19, 236, 238–40, 249,  
 264, 287  
 Lounghis, Telemachos 181, 282  
 Lükő, Gábor 37  
 Lyapushkin, Ivan 194  
 Lyubarskii, Yakov 241, 243, 280, 326
- Macartney, Carlile Aylmer 64, 65  
 Madarassy, László 34
- Madgearu, Alexandru 3, 4, 130–33, 306,  
 325  
 Magdalino, Paul 306–8  
 Makarenko, Mykola 62  
 Makarova, Tatyana 230, 232  
 Makk, Ferenc 86  
 Mako, Gerald 305  
 Makoldi, Miklós 95  
 Maksimović, Ljubomir 184  
 Malamut, Élisabeth 134, 292–96  
 Mamboury, Ernest 64  
 Mándoky Kongur, István 76  
 Mănucu-Adameșteanu, Gheorghe 125,  
 127–30, 153, 325  
 Mavrodina, Ruslana 4,  
 Mare, Mircea 121  
 Marinescu, Marina 280  
 Marjanović-Vujović, Gordana 183  
 Markopoulos, Athanasios 280  
 Markovych, Yakiv 21  
 Markwart (Marquart), Josef 28, 29, 31  
 Marx, Carl 236  
 Maslev, Stoyan 162  
 Matyushko, Irina 201  
 Maufroy, Sandrine 265  
 Mayko, Vadym 232–34  
 Medvedev, Alexandr 205–6  
 Meško, Marek 3, 176–79  
 Metcalf, David 157–58  
 Metz, Nonna 196, 235  
 Mészáros, Gyula 34  
 Mihajlovski, Robert 184  
 Mikhailov, Kirill A. 206  
 Mikov, Vasil 52  
 Miletich, Lyubomir 52  
 Miller, Mykhaylo 62  
 Miskolczi, Gyula 34  
 Mitrea, Bucur 98, 123  
 Miyatev, Kristo 52  
 Mladenov, Stefan 52  
 Mollova, Mefküre 176  
 Moravcsik, Gyula 2, 8, 20, 34, 39, 68–70, 76,  
 83, 84, 105, 162, 249, 266, 272, 324  
 Morrisson, Cécile 129, 282  
 Mushmov, Nikola 52  
 Moyseidou, Giasmína 181–82  
 Mutafchiev, Petăr 43, 51, 74, 160  
 Myts, Victor 231

- Nagrodzka-Majchrzyk, Teresa 313  
 Nagy, Árpád 92  
 Nahapetyan-Flyorova, Valentina 253  
 Năsturel, Petre Șt. 100  
 Necșulescu, Constantin 43, 45, 110  
 Nedkov, Boris 163  
 Nefédov, Filipp 27  
 Németh, Gyula (Julius) 32, 76, 78, 253  
 Nesbitt, John 273  
 Nestor, Ion 96  
 Neumann, Carl 63  
 Nikolov, Aleksandŭr 176  
 Noonan, Thomas Schaub 317, 319–21  
 Novosel'tsev, Anatoliĭ 240, 258, 287  
 Nudelman, Avram 219–20, 263  
  
 Oberländer-Tărnoveanu, Ernest 125–27,  
 153, 325  
 Obolensky, Dimitri 168, 187, 266, 268–69,  
 271, 287, 290–91, 294–95, 324  
 Ocheșeanu, Radu 123  
 Ódor, János Gábor 92  
 Oikonomidēs, Nikos 165, 191, 268, 271–74  
 Olkhovskii, Valeriĭ 229  
 Olteanu, Ștefan 111  
 Orkun, Hüseyin Namik 40  
 Ormandzhiev, Ivan 52  
 Ostrogorsky, Georgy 54, 56, 65, 181, 275  
 Oța, Silviu 121  
 Ovcharov, Dimitŭr 139–41, 143  
  
 Palauzov, Spiridon 49  
 Pálóczi-Horvát, András 93, 94  
 Panagiotakis, Nikolaos 280  
 Parkhomenko, Volodymyr 59  
 Paroń, Aleksander 301–2, 304  
 Parushev, Veselin 129  
 Pashuto, Vladimir 238, 247, 264  
 Pauler, Gyula 31  
 Pavlov, Plamen 169, 176  
 Pelliot, Paul 29  
 Perkhavko, Valeriĭ 19  
 Pertusi, Agostino 277  
 Petkes, Zsolt 89, 92  
 Petrescu-Dâmbovița, Mircea 118  
 Pinevych, Petro 62  
 Pletnyova, Svetlana 91, 115, 192–93, 195–99,  
 202, 212, 230, 234–35, 249, 263, 324  
 Poenaru-Bordea, Gheorghe 123, 125  
  
 Pogodin, Mikhail 21  
 Pokrovskii, Mikhail 57, 238  
 Polány, István 34  
 Polgár, Szabolcs 81  
 Polovoy, Nikolaĭ 237  
 Ponomaryov, Leonid 229  
 Popescu, Dorin 98  
 Popov, Pavel 201  
 Popović, Marko 184  
 Popovici, Ioana 114  
 Poppe, Andrzej 301  
 Postică, Gheorghe 205, 215–16  
 Potyomkina, Tetyana 206  
 Preda, Constantin 123, 136  
 Primov, Borislav 140  
 Priselkov, Mikhail 59, 60, 225  
 Pritsak, Omeljan 284, 317–19  
 Protase, Dumitru 98  
  
 Radić, Vesna 184  
 Rafalovich, Isak 220  
 Rambaud, Alfred 67  
 Ramm, Boris 246  
 Rashev, Rasho 141, 143  
 Rásonyi, László 36, 56, 79  
 Rasovskii, Dmitriĭ 56, 57, 79, 249  
 Reinsch, Diether 280  
 Renaud, Émile 65  
 Rigelman, Alexandr 21  
 Riley-Smith, Jonathan 308  
 Romanchuk, Alla 230  
 Romashov, Sergeĭ 257  
 Róna-Tas, András 80, 82  
 von Rosen, Viktor 25  
 Roueché, Charlotte 277  
 Rujak, Zoran 184  
 Runciman, Steven 308  
 Rybakov, Boris 223, 246  
  
 Sacerdoțeanu, Aurelian 43  
 Said, Edward 6  
 Samchevs'kyĭ, Ivan 21  
 Samokvasov, Dmitriĭ 26  
 Sâmpetru, Mihai 114–15  
 Sargologos, Étienne 277  
 Sathas, Konstantinos N. 65  
 Savvides, Alexios 180, 283  
 Schamiloglu, Uli 186  
 Schechter, Solomon 319



- Scherbak, Alexandr 253  
 von Schlözer, August Ludwig 20  
 Schlumberger, Gustave Léon 67  
 Schmit, Fëdor 265  
 Schmitt, Oliver Jens 297–98  
 Schultz, Pavel 223  
 Selmeczi, László 92  
 Senga, Toru 78  
 Şerbănescu, Done 114  
 Şesan, Milan 274  
 Şeşen, Ramazan 186  
 Ševčenko, Ihor 43, 161, 279, 283–84, 288, 314  
 Sewter, Edgar Robert Ashton 280  
 Seydaliiev, Emil 206  
 Shchepinskiĭ, Askold 227, 229  
 Shcherbak, Alexandr 193  
 Shcherbatov, Mikhail 21  
 Shepard, Jonathan 275, 285–90, 293, 297,  
     308  
 Shmagliĭ, Mykola 210  
 Shukurov, Rustam 251  
 Sideri, Aloe 280  
 Skabalanovich, Nikolaĭ 24  
 Škorpil, Karel 52  
 Skoulatos, Basile 280  
 Solovyov, Sergeĭ 21, 57  
 Soustal, Peter 277  
 Spinei, Victor 3, 114, 118–19, 120, 136  
 Spitsyn, Alexandr 26–28, 196  
 Stănescu, Eugen 112–13, 266, 294  
 Stănică, Aurel 125  
 Ştefan, Gheorghe 98, 99  
 Ştefănescu, Ştefan 102, 110–11  
 Stempkovskii, Yoel 27, 207, 214  
 Stephenson, Paul 3, 134, 274, 290–92, 297  
 Ştirbu, Constanţa 123  
 Stolyaryk, Olena 219  
 Stoyanov, Valeri 4, 5, 175–76  
 Strässle, Paul Meinrad 295–96  
 Subbotin, Leonid 210  
 Suceveanu, Alexandru 114  
 Suhm, Peter Frederik 26  
 Sümer, Faruk 186  
 Szabó, János B. 87  
 von Szalay, Ladislaus 31  
 Szegfű, László 87  
  
 Talis, David 230  
 Talmaţchi, Gabriel 125  
  
 Tanaşoca, Nicolae-Şerban 294  
 Tatishchev, Vasilii 21, 225, 246, 284  
 Teleki, Pál 32  
 Telnov, Nikolaĭ 212  
 Teodor, Dan 118  
 Teslya, Trokhym 62  
 Thurn, Hans 278  
 Tittmann, Johann August Heinrich 70  
 Tivchev, Petür 162  
 Tobias, Norman 306  
 Tocci, Raimondo 280  
 Todorov, Boris 174  
 Tolochko, Oleksiĭ 284  
 Tolstov, Sergeĭ 256  
 Tomášek, Vilém 28  
 Tonchev, Alexandr 162  
 Tortika, Alexandr 257, 261  
 Tóssér, Márton 86  
 Totev, Boyan 150  
 Toynbee, Arnold J. 289  
 Travkin, Sergeĭ 221  
 Trohani, Georghe 121  
 Tryjarski, Edward 312–14  
 Tsolakis, Eudoxos 278  
 Tsonev, Ben'0 52  
 Tŭpkova-Zaimova, Vasilka 3, 163–69, 174,  
     274, 294, 324  
 Türk, Attila 90  
  
 Ursu, Ion 206  
 Uspenskii (*Uspensky*), Fëdor 17, 19, 23,  
     53–55, 272, 275, 326  
 Ustrialov, Nikolaĭ 21  
 Uzelac, Aleksandar 185  
  
 Valeriev, Īoto 150, 174–75  
 Vámbéry, Ármin 39, 76  
 Vásáry, István 76, 78  
 Vasiliev, Alexander 17, 53–56, 236, 275  
 Vasilievskii, Vasilii 1, 7–14, 16–19, 24, 26, 49,  
     50, 53–55, 63, 68, 70, 71, 103, 107, 115,  
     187, 196, 225, 237–38, 247, 249, 268, 275,  
     284, 307, 323, 325–27  
 Vătăşianu, Virgil 98  
 Velidi Togan, Ahmet Zeki 40  
 Velikanova, Marina 218, 249, 263  
 Vernadsky, George 301  
 Veselovskii, Nikolaĭ 27, 223, 227–28  
 Vilceanu, Dumitru 100

- Vladimirov, Georgi 150  
 Vogt, Albert 277  
 Vuitch, Lidiya 193
- Wahlgren, Staffan 279  
 Wasilewski, Tadeusz 267, 325  
 Westerink, Leendert Gerrit 276  
 Whittow, Mark 284  
 Winkler, Iudith 123  
 Wortley, John 278  
 Wozniak, Frank E. 301
- Xenopol, Alexandru Dimitrie 105, 118
- Yakobson, Anatoliĭ 224–26, 230  
 Yakubovskii, Alexandr 58  
 Yanin, Valentin 238  
 Yashayeva, Tatyana 233
- Yavornyts'kyĭ, Dmytro 27  
 Yevhlevskii, Olexandr 206–7  
 Yevsieyev, Victor 62  
 Yücel, Mualla Uydu 188  
 Yushkov, Serafim 58
- Zaborov, Mikhail 18, 246  
 Zaharia, Eugenia 140  
 Zakhoder, Boris 258  
 Zakythinos, Dionysios A. 266  
 Zatyркеvich, Mikhail 22  
 Zervan, Bratislav 176  
 Zholdasbekov, Myrzataĭ 257  
 Zimonyi, István 80, 82, 311  
 Zlatarski, Vasil 46, 48–50, 56, 70, 115, 160,  
 165–66, 292  
 Zuckerman, Constantin 230, 298–99  
 Zyablin, Leonid 196, 235, 324